AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE (MARKS) BILL.

Ordered,—[*Wednesday, 7th April* 1897]:—THAT the AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE (MARKS) BILL be read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee.

Committee nominated—[*Thursday, 3rd June* 1897]—of—

Mr. Brigg.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.
Mr. Doughty.
Sir William Houldsworth.
Mr. Hozier.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Mr. Kearley.
Mr. Kilbride.
Sir John Kinloch.
Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Mildmay.
Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mr. Parker Smith.

Ordered,—THAT the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.

THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
SPECIAL REPORT - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. iii
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE - - - - - - - - p. iv
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - - - - - - - p. 1
APPENDIX - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 183
INDEX - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - p. 213

REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE on the AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE (MARKS) BILL have considered the said Bill, and have taken Evidence thereon, which they have agreed to report to the House, and have agreed to report the Bill, without Amendment.

29 *July* 1897.

SPECIAL REPORT.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE to whom the AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE (MARKS) BILL was referred;——HAVE agreed to the following SPECIAL REPORT:

Your Committee are of opinion that, at this late period of the Session, it is not possible to complete the evidence which bears upon the Bill referred to them.

They consider, therefore, that it is not practicable to proceed further with the same during the present Session, and that it be reported to the House, without Amendment.

Your Committee are of opinion that the identification of foreign meat and cheese is desirable, and that there would be no great difficulty in carrying this out in the case of foreign carcases and cheeses.

Your Committee are also of opinion that any legislation in the direction of marking meat would be inadequate unless means be taken to distinguish between British or Irish meat on the one hand, and (1) that produced in our Colonies; and (2) that produced in all other countries and landed here alive to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation on the other.

29 *July* 1897.

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 31 October, 2019

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Friday, 2nd July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir William Houldsworth.	Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.
Mr. Parker Smith.	Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Mr. Brigg.	Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. Doughty.	Mr. MacAleese.
Sir John Kinloch.	Mr. A. H. Smith.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH was called to the Chair.

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Thursday, 8th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH in the Chair.

Mr. Briggs.	Mr. Wingfield Digby.
Sir John Kinloch.	Mr. Mildmay.
Mr. MacAleese.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mr. Parker Smith.	Mr. Doughty.
Sir Elliott Lees.	

Mr. *Henry William Primrose*, C.B., Mr. *Robert Henry Rew*, and Mr. *Jeffreys* (a Member of the House), were examined.

[Adjourned till To-morrow, at Twelve o'clock.

Friday, 9th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH in the Chair.

Mr. Mildmay.	Mr. Briggs.
M. A. H. Smith.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. MacAleese.	Mr. Kilbride.
Sir John Kinloch.	Mr. Wingfield Digby.
Mr. Doughty.	

Mr. *William Cooper* was examined.

[Adjourned till Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Tuesday, 13*th July* 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH in the Chair.

Mr. Brigg.	Mr. Doughty.
Mr. MacAleese.	Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. Parker Smith.	Mr. Mildmay.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Wingfield Digby.
Sir John Kinloch.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. A. H. Smith.	Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Mr. Hozier.	

Mr. *Thomas Davies* and Mr. *George P. Terrett* were examined.

[Adjourned till Wednesday, 21st July, at Half-past Eleven o'clock.

Wednesday, 21*st July* 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Elliott Lees.	Mr. Wingfield Digby.
Mr. Brigg.	Mr. Hozier.
Sir John Kinloch.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mr. MacAleese.	Mr. Doughty.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Heywood Johnstone.

In the absence of the Chairman, Sir ELLIOTT LEES took the Chair.

Mr. *Andrew Hutcheson*, Mr. *Edmond Hill*, Mr. *Herbert Smith*, and Mr. *William Henry Beach* were examined.

[Adjourned till Friday next, at Half-past Eleven o'clock.

Friday, 23*rd July* 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir Elliott Lees.	Mr. Parker Smith.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mr. MacAleese.	Mr. Doughty.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Kilbride.

In the absence of the Chairman, Sir ELLIOTT LEES took the Chair.

Mr. *John Kellitt*, Mr. *Alfred Samuel Page*, Mr. *Robert Challinor*, Mr. *Morgan Hopkin*, and Mr. *John Francis Tee* were examined.

[Adjourned until Tuesday next, at Half-past Eleven o'clock.

Tuesday, 27th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH in the Chair.

Sir Elliott Lees.	Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Brigg.	Mr. Wingfield Digby.
Mr. A. H. Smith.	

Mr. *Isaac Stephenson*, Professor *James Wilson Robertson*, Mr. *James McInnes Sinclair*, and Mr. *Henry Charles Cameron* were examined.

[Adjourned till To-morrow, at Half-past Eleven o'clock.

Wednesday, 28th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH in the Chair.

Sir Elliott Lees.	Mr. Wingfield-Digby.
Mr. Brigg.	Mr. Doughty.
Mr. Mildmay.	Mr. MacAleese.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Mr. Kilbride.	Mr. A. H. Smith.

Mr. *Michael Byrne*, Mr. *William Coggan*, and Mr. *James Hudson* were examined.

DRAFT SPECIAL REPORT, proposed by the *Chairman*, brought up, and read the first time, as follows:—

"Your Committee are of opinion that, at this late period of the Session, it is not possible to complete the evidence which bears upon the Bill referred to them.

"They consider, therefore, that it is not practicable to proceed further with the same during the present Session, and that it be reported to the House, without Amendment."

DRAFT REPORT read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be added to the Report:—

"Your Committee are of opinion that the identification of foreign meat and cheese is desirable, and that there would be no great difficulty in carrying out this identification of foreign carcases and cheeses"—(Mr. *A. H. Smith*)—Question proposed, That the proposed new paragraph be added to the Report.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new paragraph, to leave out all the words after the word "that," and insert the words "It is undesirable to adopt any measures for marking foreign meat, cheese, hams, or bacon, or to register or license butchers, grocers, or provision merchants for the sale of such goods. That no evidence has been produced that the consumers are dissatisfied with the present methods of free trade on these goods. That it is impossible to carry out the marking satisfactorily, either to the advantage of the farmer, merchant, or consumer, and that such proposal implies dishonesty in trading amongst grocers, butchers, and provision merchants with their customers. No case for such suggestion has been made in the evidence placed before this Committee"—(Mr. *Doughty*).—Question put, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed paragraph.—The Committee divided:

Ayes, 7.	Noes, 3.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Brigg.
Mr. Digby.	Mr. Doughty.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Kilbride.	
Mr. MacAleese.	
Mr. Mildmay.	
Mr. A. H. Smith.	

Question

Question put, That the proposed new paragraph be added to the Report.—The Committee divided :

Ayes, 7.	Noes, 3.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Brigg.
Mr. Digby.	Mr. Doughty.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Kilbride.	
Mr. MacAleese.	
Mr. Mildmay.	
Mr. A. H. Smith.	

Another Amendment proposed, That the following new paragraph be added to the Report :—"Your Committee are also of opinion that any legislation in the direction of marking meat would be inadequate unless means be taken to distinguish between British or Irish meat on the one hand, and (1) that produced in our Colonies, and (2) that produced in all other countries and landed here alive, to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, on the other"—(Mr. *A. H. Smith*).—Question put, That this paragraph be added to the Report.—The Committee divided :

Ayes, 6.	Noes, 3.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Mr. Brigg.
Mr. Digby.	Mr. Doughty.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. MacAleese.	
Mr. Mildmay.	
Mr. A. H. Smith.	

Question, That this Report be the Special Report of the Committee to the House,—put, and *agreed to.*

Ordered, To Report, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and an Appendix.

Ordered, To Report the Bill, without Amendment, to the House.

EXPENSES OF WITNESSES.

NAME OF WITNESS.	PROFESSION OR CONDITION.	From whence Summoned.	Number of Days Absent from Home under Orders of Committee.	Allowance during Absence from Home.	Expenses of Journey to London and back.	TOTAL Expenses allowed to Witness.
				£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Thomas Davies -	President, Wirral Farmers' Club.	Birkenhead - - -	2	2 2 –	3 – –	5 2 –
Morgan Hopkin -	President, Butchers' Association.	Swansea - - -	2	2 2 –	2 15 9	4 17 9
Robert J. Challinor -	Secretary, Cheshire Dairy Farmers' Association.	Chester - - -	2	2 2 –	3 2 –	5 4 –
Isaac Stephenson -	President, Butchers' Association.	Leeds - - -	2	2 2 –	2 15 6	4 17 6
Michael Byrne - -	President, Butchers' Association.	Birkenhead - -	2	2 2 –	3 – –	5 2 –
John Kellitt - -	President, Grocers' Federation.	Liverpool - - -	2	2 2 –	3 2 –	5 4 –
					TOTAL - - - £.	30 7 3

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Thursday, 8th July 1897.

	PAGE
Mr. H. W. Primrose, C.B., C.S.I. - -	1
Mr. Robert Henry Rew - - -	8
Mr. Arthur F. Jeffreys, M.P. - - -	19

Friday, 9th July 1897.

Mr. William Cooper - - - -	24

Tuesday, 13th July 1897.

Mr. Thomas Davies - - - -	49
Mr. George Terrett - - - -	61

Wednesday, 21st July 1897.

Mr. Andrew Hutcheson - - -	70
Mr. Edmond Hill - - - - -	81
Mr. Herbert Smith - - - -	91
Mr. W. H. Beach, M.R.C.V.S. - -	99

Friday, 23rd July 1897.

	PAGE
Mr. John Kellitt - - - - -	100
Mr. Alfred Samuel Page - - -	112
Mr. R. Challinor - - - - -	117
Mr. Morgan Hopkin - - - -	124
Mr. John Francis Tee - - - -	131

Tuesday, 27th July 1897.

Mr. Isaac Stephenson - - - -	136
Professor James W. Robertson - -	143
Mr. James M. Sinclair - - - -	149
Mr. Henry Charles Cameron - -	153

Wednesday, 28th July 1897.

Mr. Michael Byrne - - - -	159
Mr. William Coggan - - - -	168
Mr. James Hudson - - - -	177

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Thursday, 8th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brigg.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Doughty.	Mr. Mildmay.
Sir William Houldsworth.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Sir John Kinloch.	Mr. Parker Smith.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. H. W. PRIMROSE, C.B., C.S.I., called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1. YOU are Chairman of the Board of Customs?—I am.

2. And you are aware what articles it is that this Bill refers to?—Yes; I have read the Bill.

3. I think I am right in saying it is meat and cheese?—Yes.

4. And the meat may be either fresh meat, or hams, or bacon?—Yes.

5. Can you give us the amounts of imports, first of all, of meat?—I have here a volume of the Annual Statement of Trade of the United Kingdom which has just been published, which contains all that information. I have not put it together in the form of a table, but I can easily have it done; or if you would prefer that I should take the figures out now. I have the table here before me.

6. What year is that return for?—This is for the year 1896.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

7. Has it been presented to us yet?—It is only just out, and I think within the last day or two.

8. It has not come through the Vote Office?—Yes, I think it must have. C. 8499 is the number.

9. Is that in a form that you can give us the total imports of foreign meat?—I have practically got them in a convenient form in another Paper, I think.

10. We only want it very generally, I think, unless something turns on it later on; can you give us the total weight or value of the imports of foreign meat to which this Bill would refer?

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

—Yes. For the present I will not take live animals, because they are not affected by the Bill. I am referring to page 14. I will take beef first.

11. Can you give me an approximate figure, or one that you think fairly represents the total amount?—Beef, mutton, pork, rabbits, salted and canned meats, taking all those together in round figures 19½ million cwts. That figure, I should say, includes the live meat.

12. We will take that figure because it may, perhaps, be useful at a later stage. That one million tons represents dead meat and live cattle?—Yes.

13. Of all kinds?—Of all kinds.

14. Can you tell me now the dead meat to which this Bill refers?—Dead meat 13¼ million cwts.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

15. Then there is more dead meat than alive meat?—Yes.

Chairman.

16. Can you give us, at the same time, cheese?—2,244,525 cwts., roughly 2¼ millions. That figure is taken from C. 8499, page 14.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

17. That is last year?—That is the calendar year 1896.

Chairman.

18. And the former figure you gave was also 1896?—I think I would ask you to discard the former figure, because it included the live animals, and it also included lard, which is a considerable

Chairman—continued.

figure, 1,700,000 cwts., which, I think, perhaps, would not be affected by the Bill.

19. Is lard the only item in that figure that would not be affected by the Bill?—Yes.

20. Then, I think, we will take your figure as you gave it to us. Of that, how much is lard?—Perhaps, if you would alter the first figure to 17½ millions instead of 19½ millions, that would make it right.

21. And the 13½ millions of dead meat is correct?—That is correct.

22. Can you say whether it is an increasing trade for the last 10 years?—Oh, yes, very.

23. Year by year?—Year by year, yes.

24. Can you give us the figures of five or ten years ago?—Not at this moment; I should have to put them together. I have got the materials for it here for each year back to 1892.

25. If the Committee wish that, perhaps you can give us the figures?—I can give the figures in any form the Committee wish.

26. Is 1892 the year that you can most conveniently give?—I could give it for any year really, only this volume happens to go back to 1892. I could have it taken out, and I could give a series of years.

27. Perhaps you would give us a statement simply on the lines of the figures you have already given for the years included in that return from 1892 up to the present time, year by year?—Yes.

28. Now, the Bill as drafted does not contemplate any action at the time of importation?—No, not as the Bill now stands.

29. And therefore the Customs Department would have no power to take any action to see that the Bill was carried out; is that so?—That is so, as I read the Bill.

30. No power is granted in the Bill for the Customs Department to prevent meat coming in although it is not marked?—No; it does not touch meat until it is sold or exposed for sale.

31. Do you think that if this Bill became an Act it would be desirable, in order to carry out the objects of the Bill efficiently, for some clause to be inserted putting the responsibility and duty upon the Customs Department of seeing that no foreign meat or cheese can come in unless it was marked according to law?—I think not, for this reason, that no action that we could take at the moment of importation would dispense with the necessity of a local action such as is contemplated under the Bill. The mischief which the Bill aims at affecting is a mischief which does not occur until after importation. It arises on the retail selling of this foreign meat. At the time of importation, and as long as the wholesale dealing in carcases goes on, there is no deception, and there is no possibility of deception, because anybody can recognise a carcase, although it may not be quite easy to recognise a joint cut from that carcase after it has been properly treated. Therefore at the present time there is no serious mischief in the way of deception in regard to foreign meat at the moment of importation.

32. Does the Bill as you read it not affect the wholesale sale of this meat?—No doubt it does, but I do not imagine that there really is any

Chairman—continued.

necessity for action as regards the wholesale dealing in this meat, because everybody knows when they are buying wholesale that they are buying foreign meat. There is no possibility of concealing that fact.

33. How do they know that?—Because it is dealt in only by certain firms, certain importers, and they are well known; and the butchers who buy from them know perfectly well that they are buying imported meat.

34. How do the butchers know that they are buying imported meat; is there any definite statement that it is?—They are dealing with men who are avowed dealers in imported meat.

35. That is the way that you say the butcher must know that it is foreign meat, because he is dealing with a man who only deals in foreign meat; is that so?—Certainly; in the first transactions that take place after importation, I should say that was the case. It is possible that there may be intermediate transactions of a wholesale character, in which the origin of the meat might conceivably be lost. The only thing is that I fancy anybody can tell a whole carcase that has been imported frozen, any expert. No expert can be deceived as to whether or no the whole carcase was a carcase of an imported animal, or a carcase of an animal killed in this country, and my opinion is that for so long as the dealings in meat are between professionals on both sides, there is no need to protect the buyer by marks.

36. You say the carcase itself would to an expert show whether it was imported meat or not, although he had no information as to the origin of it?—That is what I believe to be the case. Perhaps I ought to say that on a point of that kind it would be better probably to take evidence from somebody else.

37. That is your impression?—That is what I understand to be the case.

38. Then if that is so you do not see that any strengthening of the Bill would be gained by imposing the responsibility upon the Customs Department to prevent the admission into the country of foreign meat?—I think not, because I do not think that it would assist the local authority, who must exercise supervision over the sale of this meat in retail. I doubt whether any action that we might take can really very greatly assist them. It might be of some assistance that carcases should arrive in this country very fully marked, if a means of marking them can be devised that is not injurious. That is, of course, a point on which I cannot speak.

39. If by Act of Parliament the Customs Department were held responsible for preventing the admission of foreign meat unless it was marked, of course that would, if it was efficiently carried out, practically do all that the Bill desires: there would be no unmarked foreign meat come into the country?—But I think it would be still necessary to maintain machinery to see that those marks were not removed.

40. I do not quite follow that, because if you prevent foreign meat coming in without being marked, you would prevent the sale of it, would you not?—You would not ensure that it was sold with the marks on it.

41. No; but you would absolutely prevent any

Chairman—continued.

any foreign meat that had not been marked coming in?—No doubt, but I do not think that would effect the object.

42. The point, I suppose you mean, is this: that the retail butcher would still be able to sell foreign meat (although it came in marked), as English meat?—I think so.

43. That is your point? Yes.

44. Then, I gather that that disposes of the Customs Department being able to assist at all in carrying out the objects of the Bill?—That is the first ground upon which I think that it would not greatly help the object of this Bill. It might do something, but it would not do a great deal, and what it did do, it would do at very considerable cost.

45. Will you tell us what it would do, because I gather from your evidence, it would do nothing?—It would do something at a point where it is not necessary to do anything. I mean already when the carcases are imported, they are known to be imported carcases, and all the people who deal with them, in that condition, are perfectly aware that they are imported carcases. Therefore, at that stage, nothing is required in the way of marking.

46. I think I am right in saying that the effect of your evidence is that the Customs Department would not be able to do practically anything to strengthen the provisions of this Bill?—I think not, because I think that you would still have to have all the machinery that you would now have to have under this Bill locally, that you would not save any trouble or any expense, or that you would not facilitate the operations of the local authorities very greatly by having the carcases marked when they came in. It might do so to a certain extent. Then you have to consider what the cost of it means and what the difficulties of it are.

47. That is another matter, but I quite gather that it practically would not be of any service in strengthening this Bill?—Not, in my opinion.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

48. You say the butchers would still sell meat which had been marked. Does not that depend upon the way in which it had been marked?—Yes, no doubt.

Chairman.

49. Unless some portions of it which are going to be retailed were marked there would be no great strengthening of the Bill by two or three marks being put upon the carcases, which might or might not pass in retail trade?—Quite so. It would affect the wholesale business at Smithfield Market, for instance, but not, I think, at the moment of importation; not until after importation.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

50. If the meat is only marked on the carcases or sides or hams of the animals, would not that be a matter affecting the wholesale trade rather than the retail?—When the importer begins to sell it would affect him.

51. But the Customs Department would be quite as able to see to the marking of animals in that large sense (on the carcase, or sides, or hams of the animals)?—Yes, it could be done.

Chairman.

52. The point is that as the Bill is framed you point out that at the moment of importation, when the Customs Department have to do with it, there has been no "dealing in selling, offering, exposing, or keeping for sale"?—That is how I read the Bill.

53. But still the question arises whether the Customs Department could be of service at all in preventing this dealing in, selling, offering, and exposing for sale later on, and that, as you point out, depends upon the way in which the carcases were marked?—I do not mean to imply that we could be of use later on.

Mr. *Brigg.*

54. These people who are engaged in the wholesale meat trade you, I suppose, consider experts?—Yes.

55. Is there any probability that they are deceived at all in their dealing with the importations of meat, when they buy in bulk is it likely that they are ever deceived as to buying something which they do not understand?—I should say no probability at all.

56. They are not likely to be deceived by the fact that they are buying foreign meat and not knowing of it?—Quite so.

57. The meat is enclosed in wrappings of some kind?—Yes, they are wrapped in linen wraps.

58. And trade marks of course marked on the wrappers?—Yes.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

59. You say any marks by the Customs Department would only affect the wholesale trade which is already safeguarded?—Unless it were possible to mark in such a way that almost every portion of the surface was marked.

60. In the Bill as now drawn the wholesale trade as I understand it is the only trade affected?—Yes, that is true.

61. I think if you will read Clause 3, you will see that that only deals with such marking as you contemplate being suggested for the Customs Department to carry out?—Yes; but if you go to Clause 4, I think, obviously, the object of the Bill is rather to control the retail trade than the wholesale.

Chairman.

62. Assuming for a moment that it is thought by the Committee that there would be an advantage in the carcases being marked at the point of importation, is it a practicable suggestion that the Customs Department should themselves undertake to mark. Assuming, that the foreign meat comes in unmarked, could the Customs Department undertake to mark the meat as foreign meat, so that when it went into the hands of the wholesale dealers, there would be a guarantee that the foreign meat would be marked?—No, I think that would be quite impracticable, because of the enormous size of the importations. For instance, only last week there was a single cargo of 90,000 carcases out of a single ship. Well, obviously if they had arrived unmarked the attempt to mark them on arrival would be hopeless; I mean the probability is that a very large quantity of the meat would be injured. I

Chairman—continued.

do not mean to say that if very elaborate arrangements were made in the way of cold storage sheds, into which every cargo might be brought, it could not be done; but it would be done at very great expense.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

63. Supposing an Act were passed making it compulsory that all these carcases imported should be marked, would not a practical effect of that be that they would be marked before they arrived in this country?—No doubt.

Chairman.

64. I was going on to that, but I was confining myself for the moment to whether the Customs Department could mark. I was going then to ask you if you think it is impracticable (or at any rate it would be at an enormous cost, which the Committee might not think desirable) whether there is any way of ensuring the marking by the consignors?—Yes. I do not think there would be any doubt if such a law were passed that the majority of cargoes would within a very short time be properly marked, because the trade is from a comparatively few countries, and goes through comparatively few channels, and I take it it is very largely in the hands of a few great companies, and, no doubt, they would very quickly see that they sent nothing to this country that was not marked in accordance with the Act. There is the further reason why one might expect that; that I understand, providing the meat can be marked without being injured, there is nothing that these large importers, and the exporters at the other side, would like so much as that it should be marked.

65. You think they would like to mark it?—Yes, that is their view, that they would be very glad that it should always be distinguished by a mark.

66. And therefore you think in that way practically this law would be carried out willingly by the exporters?—I think so, always provided that a means of marking could be devised that would not injure the meat. On that point I believe there is a great deal of doubt; I do not know; I have not examined it myself.

67. Assuming for the moment that your view was not the correct one, and that the consignors did not wish to mark the meat, or neglected to do so, of course to make that effective the Customs Department would have to have some power to prevent the importation of meat not marked?—Yes.

68. Then if that was carried out, would not difficulties arise as to what you were to do with meat that arrived not marked. It would practically, I suppose, become useless, would it not?—Of course, if it came in any very large quantities, to apply the principles on which we act under the Merchandise Marks Acts, what we ought to do would be to condemn the meat, unless there was some ground for supposing that the defective marking was due to an oversight or an accident, in which case the defect might be remedied on arrival. The remedy on arrival would require a certain amount of arrangement. We should have to provide what we have not got now, some places

Chairman—continued.

of cold storage, where the meat could be kept while it was being marked, and so on. That would not be an insuperable difficulty.

69. What would you do with the meat that you were not disposed to allow to be treated in that way as an oversight?—I suppose the only way of really enforcing the Act would be to condemn the meat.

70. What does that mean in regard to the other articles that the Merchandise Act applies to?—They are forfeited altogether.

71. And sold?—If the marks that offend against the Act can be removed the marks are removed, and they are sold at auction. But it does not often happen; it has happened of course; and in the earlier years after the Act was passed it happened pretty frequently. Now it very seldom arises.

72. In the case of meat that was not marked at all and was contrary to the Act, and as to which you were not disposed to consider it was an oversight and might be remedied; in that case the only course would be to have the meat forfeited and sold?—We should then I suppose mark it and sell it.

73. So the arrangement would be that exporters would lose the value of the meat, is that so?—Yes, that, of course, is the extreme penalty.

74. However, I think it is a rather valuable opinion that you have just given, which is, you think, that if this law was enacted exporters would be very willing to comply with the law?—I think so, subject to the overcoming of the practical difficulty of marking.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

75. I suppose you think that the men who export the meat, or rather send the meat here, would look upon that as a means of protection to themselves against the low quality of home meat that is very often sold in the markets late on Saturday night, when you have old cows and bull meat and cattle of that kind sold, and the meat is palmed off upon the public as being foreign meat. I suppose it is as a protection to themselves that you think they would wish to have this marking?—I suppose so; they wish their meat to be sold on its merits.

76. They have sufficient confidence in their own mark and the quality of their own meat to defy any competition; that is practically what you mean?—Yes.

Chairman.

77. With regard to cheese, hams, and bacon, I think you are of opinion that there would be less difficulty in seeing that these were marked?—Of course they are less perishable, and time is not of so much importance in dealing with them on importation.

78. You will please furnish us with a statement of figures from 1892 corresponding to those which you have given us for the last year?—Yes.

79. You have given us cheese for 1896; will you also give a return as to cheese since 1892; I may suggest, perhaps, that in marking out this return it would be as well to give the details of mutton, beef, hams, bacon, cheese, and so on, and then total them up?—Yes.

80. Also

Chairman—continued.

80. Also giving us the addition, excluding lard?—Excluding lard and excluding live animals.

81. I think you had better give us the live animals, but give them separately?—Yes.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

82. Can you give us also the total consumption in the country?—That is very difficult to give. You will find an estimate of that in the Return of the Board of Agriculture, which is just out.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

83. Did I understand you that there would be no difficulty about marking cheese?—No; I should think the trade would very soon adapt itsef to the law, and most of the cheese would come marked; but in the event of a consignment coming in unmarked, and an excuse for the omission, I think there would be no very great difficulty on marking it on importation.

84. You mentioned just now that consignors of meat from abroad were very anxious that this Bill should pass, as a protection to them; have you heard anything of the same sort with regard to the consignors of cheese?—No, I do not know anything about that.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

85. Your statement that it would be no good for the Customs authorities to see that the meat was marked is based on your opinion that the marks could be erased before the meat was retailed?—Yes, there is the possibility of their being erased.

86. I gather that you thought that that method of marking by the Customs authorities would be no good as a protection to the retail buyer?—I think a very imperfect protection. I doubt whether it would be really any protection. Of course a great deal would depend upon the method of marking, and how far it was indelible, and so on.

87. Surely meat could be marked in such a way that it would be absolutely impossible to erase it without it being seen?—I am not prepared to say; that is a point on which my evidence would be of no value.

88. Are you aware that in foreign countries meat is marked in such a way in the port of entry, and that it is never erased, and it is a most admirable way?—I am not aware of that. I have heard it stated, but I have no actual knowledge of the facts.

89. But you can conceive that it should be possible that meat should be so marked as it is abroad by the Customs authority, or at the port of entry, that it should act as an effective protection of the retail buyer?—I think you would always have to have some local control over the retail seller, whatever you did at the port of importation; that is my own opinion.

90. My point is that effective protection could be given to the retail buyer by marking the meat at the port of disembarkation, and if the marking was done in such a way that it could not be erased, as it is done abroad, it would be effectual?—Of course, if it could be done then, no doubt, it would be a valuable aid, but it all turns upon what can be done in the way of marking.

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

91. I gather that your chief objection to marking by the Customs authorities is the extra work and the extra expense that would be entailed?—I ought, perhaps, to explain that there would be no question under any circumstances of our marking. All that we should do would be to require that they should be marked either before importation or on importation. We could never actually undertake the duty of marking. That, however, is a mere detail. But my objection to it is that it means a very considerable delay in the landing of those cargoes, and that any delay in the landing of the cargoes is a serious thing, and that unless it is to be really valuable as a protection to the public, I do not think it would be wise to interpose that delay in the landing of the cargoes. It is of the utmost importance that a cargo of this kind should be transferred as rapidly as possible from the ship in which it comes to the cold storage in which it is to be kept, and the mere examination of a percentage of a cargo of 90,000 carcases means a very considerable delay in getting that cargo away from the ship.

92. You are not aware that abroad, where this system is in existence, there are no complaints as to delay, and, now it has got into working order, the whole thing works smoothly?—Yes, but I should imagine that the volume of trade abroad is very small compared with what it is here.

93. But I suppose the same objections would be taken if there were such objections abroad?—Yes, but I think the immerse volume of our trade aggravates those objections very much.

94. They may not have so many cargoes, but the same sized cargoes arrive abroad as arrive here?—I should doubt that, but I really do not know.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

95. I understand, the figures you have given us come out from this table, from the annual statement of trade in the United Kingdom?—Yes, those last figures that I gave you did come from there.

96. I see Table 24 of the general imports of foreign and colonial merchandise, in the year 1896, on page 62 you have all the successive items, living animals coming from the different countries, and then bacon, beef, and so on. I suppose, really, the figures you have given are got by taking these altogether?—Yes. They are compiled from the entries of goods at each port.

Chairman.

97. Are the figures you have given an addition of these figures, or are they from another source?—They would be an addition of those figures.

98. If those were added up they would be what you have given us?—Yes.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

99. Do you think that these heads, if extracted, would give us what we want?—Page 14, if you will turn back to that, would be the page I should use.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

100. Page 16 is the summary: the total quantities?—Yes.

101. But I think it would be interesting to the Committee to have the greater detail that you would get if you put those heads out of page 62 together?—The only difference there is, that that shows the countries from which they come.

102. It shows the countries of origin?—Yes.

103. That shows the number of the different kinds of animals, and it shows the countries of origin?—Yes.

Chairman.

104. The difference between the two would be that, in the one case, you would not have the country of origin, and in the other case you would?—Yes; but the totals would be the same.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

105. But if the proper paragraphs are cut out of this table, Number 24, we shall have much more full information?—The only difference will be that you will also have the country of origin.

106. I should wish to have that. I would suggest the information should be given in the form of taking the paragraphs out of Table 24, which gives us the countries of origin and also breaks up the thing into more heads?—That is so.

Chairman.

107. Perhaps the best way would be to give us a statement out of page 14 first, which would be more general, and then another statement with the country of origin?—Very well.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

108. In Table 24 lard I see is separate from meat. I think you said the lard went with the meat?—That was an accident. I included lard; it was a return that had been given to me and lard was included, which I do not think really ought to have come in.

109. In any case, of course we should have a great deal more information if we got the approximate paragraphs put together out of Table 24, than if we merely got the summaries?—Yes, if you wish to know the countries from which it comes.

110. And wish to know the quantity of beef as compared with the quantity of mutton for example?—Yes.

Chairman.

111. We should like both; a summary and a detailed statement would be useful?—Yes.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

112. There is another statement in this book which I think the Committee might with advantage have before them; that is Table No. 25, page 132. That gives the imports at the different ports?—Yes, that could be done.

113. That would give us an idea of the relative importance of the different ports in regard to this matter?—I think if I might suggest it would make rather a complicated return if we took all these ports on page 132, and for practical purposes it would be enough to take London and Liverpool, and then put all other ports together, because the whole of the imported mutton from Australasia you may say comes to London. London and Liverpool between them account for the best portion of the dead meat that arrives.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

114. I should like to have Glasgow brought in?—Very well, London, Liverpool, and Glasgow, and then other ports. I think that would readily give you all that you want.

115. Then you spoke about the question of whether a whole carcase was unmistakable. I suppose you do not speak as an expert as regards that. It is what you have heard?—Quite so; I do not speak as an expert.

116. I do not know that there is information as to the parts of meat. For example, I believe sweetbreads are imported to-day from abroad. Does a thing like that appear separately in any of these tables?—No, I think not. I think that would be included under the heading "Meat." If you look at the bottom of page 16, there is meat unenumerated: "Meat Unenumerated, Salted or Fresh, and Meat preserved otherwise than by Salting," and I think things of that kind would all come under that head.

117. I am told; I do not know whether you have any knowledge yourself that sweetbreads are often imported for the London markets from abroad when they are not to be had at home; you have not any information about that, I suppose?—I do not know. It is possible that they have in the Statistical Department, but I should doubt their keeping a separate head.

118. You spoke about the Merchandise Marks Act; have you, as a fact, any perishable articles to deal with under that Act?—It applies equally to perishable articles, yes. It applies to all articles. But, as a rule, the perishables come in unmarked, except in the case of butter, for instance. But we often have to deal with butter and eggs under the Merchandise Marks Act.

119. Does the Merchandise Act apply to cheese equally?—Yes, but you see the Merchandise Marks Act does not require that cheeses should be marked. Therefore, probably, the majority of cheeses come in unmarked altogether, and then the Act does not apply. It is only when there is a mark which is misleading.

120. Only when it is actually marked English; not when it is similar to an English production?—No.

121. Suppose a Stilton cheese came in?—I remember a case not long ago in which some American cheese came marked "Cheddar." Well, it was a question rather whether Cheddar is what they call a generic term; whether it means the method of manufacture, or whether it means the place of origin; but we decided, if I remember right, that a cheese coming from America marked "Cheddar" ought to be marked "American Cheddar," so as to leave no doubt.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

122. As a matter of fact, I suppose, most cheese does not require to be marked with the country of origin; it comes in unmarked?—As a rule it comes in unmarked.

123. Did

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

123. Did you say eggs came under the Merchandise Marks Act?—Suppose they come in a hamper, then if the hamper or the case in which they are is marked in a way which would seem to imply that they are English goods, we should object to that.

124. In working the Merchandise Marks Act, have you often had to destroy perishable articles of this sort?—No, I think not; but we have detained butter, for instance, on the ground that it was not butter but margarine. Sardines is a thing that we have had a good many detentions of; but I do not remember that in any case it has resulted in the destruction, by deterioration or otherwise, of the articles themselves.

125. In any case it has not been at all on a scale which it would be if meat was brought in under a similar Act?—No.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

126. I think you said that the retail sellers of meat practically always know when they are buying foreign meat?—That is my impression.

127. Is it not the case that foreign meat passes through a good many hands before it gets to the retail sellers; in a great many cases two or three hands?—That is possible. Before it gets to the Provinces it is possible that it may; but that is a point of ttade practice which I should not be able to speak upon.

128. At any rate you can say that it is the case that a good deal of meat, for instance, comes from America in the form of chilled beef not actually frozen?—Yes.

129. Do you think it is always possible for that to be identified?—That I could not say.

130. You would rather we asked an expert that question?—Yes.

131. Then with regard to the expense and delay which would be caused in the Customs Department if the custom of marking meat before importation was established, I think you said it would not cause any great expense or delay in the Customs Department?—It would not cause so much expense. We should probably examine only a very small percentage of the number of carcases; but while that is going on, the rest of the cargo cannot be delivered out of charge until our examination is complete and we are satisfied that the cargo is properly marked.

132. But I mean in the case of other importations which you have to examine for some purpose or another, you do not examine every piece; or every carcase, or whatever it may be. You examine a certain number?—Yes, only a small percentage, according to the class of goods, and the number of different packages in a consignment, and so on.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

133. You are in favour of marking the meat at what I call the port of delivery, Liverpool or London, as the case may be?—I think that will be quite impracticable.

134. By the Customs Board; but would it be impracticable by the local authority?—I think so, because I think it would mean such an immense delay in getting a cargo landed.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

135. Is it within your knowledge that dead meat is not permitted to be landed at Dublin, or Belfast; that Belfast butchers, for instance, must provide themselves with foreign meat, either at Glasgow, or Liverpool, as they cannot have it at Belfast?—No, I was not aware of that.

136. I will ask you if you do not think that gives rather an unfair monopoly to Liverpool, and Glasgow, and if you know whether the reasons for prohibiting foreign meat from being landed at Belfast, and Dublin, are cogent reasons?—I know of no reason, unless it is the rule of the local authority. It is not a rule imposed by the Customs.

137. Would you think that marking, if carried out at all, ought to be carried out under the inspection of the local authority and not by the Customs Board?—It would be quite contrary to all the principles of our administration that we should undertake any actual work in connection with importation. We never do that. All that we do is to examine, and to pass as satisfactory, or not satisfactory. If it is not satisfactory, then the agents of the importer have to correct any error that there may be.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

138. Is every separate carcase examined by the Custom House officers to see whether it is fit for food?—O, no. So far as there is any such examination that would be done, I take it, by the local authority. I think that is practically a local matter; a matter of local health.

Mr. *Doughty.*

139. I understand you give it as a very clear opinion that the marking of the meat must be done before it is shipped?—I think it is a matter of practical necessity.

140. Would it be possible for you to examine this meat after it arrives if, as I understand, the whole of it comes in sheets; it comes in some sort of sheets, does it not?—Yes.

141. If the meat itself is to be marked, it seems that the sheet would have to be removed?—Yes.

142. If you have a cargo of 90,000 carcases, does it not almost seem a practical impossibility that the Customs can verify that every portion of the carcase is marked?—If such a law were passed, I should think at the most we should examine probably 1 per cent.: select a certain number, what are called in the case of case goods, "openers." We select a certain number of things, and we say "open them." We should select a certain number of carcases and say, "Take the cloth off them, and let us see how they look," and I should think probably a very small percentage, perhaps less than 1 per cent. of a large consignment, would be examined in that way. Still, it means examining several hundred carcases, if the thing is to be done at all effectively.

143. Do you really think it would be of any real service that one carcase should be examined in every 100?—I think it would be as much as would be practicable. That, I think, is a very strong objection to endeavouring to do anything

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

at the port of importation; that you can do so very little. At the same time, as I say, I think the probability is that the marking, if it could be well done, would be done, and that a very cursory examination would be probably sufficient to satisfy; but even that cursory examination does mean considerable delay in the landing of the cargo.

144. I understood you to say something about the retail trade having to be supervised by local control; do you mean by local inspectors in each town?—Yes.

145. I suppose you mean by that, that when the carcase is cut up for sale every separate portion should by some means have a mark upon it, so that the inspector may be able to tell it is foreign-made?—No.

Chairman.

146. I think that is perhaps a question you can scarcely answer. You have been following simply what the Bill suggests in matters out of your own Department?—That is so. Assuming that there is this mischief (and that I can give no evidence about), that this meat is sold constantly as English meat, I doubt whether anything that you do at the port of importation would guard against it effectively.

Mr. *Doughty.*

147. From something that has been said this morning, I understand there are a good many sweetbreads imported; can you give the Committee any information as to how they could be branded?—No, I should not like to endeavour to do that.

148. You have already given an opinion as to cheese; but with respect to hams and bacon, do you know whether people that import large quantities of hams and bacon would be very glad to have their meat marked; have you heard any expression of opinion about it?—No, I have not.

Mr. *Brigg.*

149. Is the position you take up with reference to assuming there would not be much difficulty in dealing with the marking of this meat as it comes into your hands largely due to the fact that the men who sent away the meat would be glad to put their own marks upon it; that there would be no inducement on their part to keep off the marks, consequently you say that you apprehend there would be very little difficulty in dealing with it; that the importers of the meat would be proud to have their marks on the carcases, and consequently it would not mean that you should exercise any special supervision?—That I believe is the case.

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

150. And they would do so on the ground that they believe that their meat is so good that they would be quite willing for it to take its own position in the market where it may be sold, sold on its own merits?—Yes, that is what I understand.

151. And I gather from you that would save you a good deal of trouble?—Yes.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

152. Will you tell us exactly how you would have to deal with the dead meat on arrival?—We hardly take any notice of it at all. It is absolutely free. There is no duty and there is no possibility of its concealing dutiable articles. Therefore, practically, it is passed over the side without any supervision by the Customs officers.

153. Do you count it in any way for the purpose of these returns?—No, we do not take any account.

154. How are these returns arrived at?—When I say we do not take any account, we do not what is called "tally." But each consignee, before he can take any article away from the ship, has to pass what is called a free entry; that is to say, he has to go to the Custom House and state that on such-and-such a ship he has such-and-such goods. A man has to say, "I have 10,000 carcases," and he would have to pass a free entry for those 10,000 carcases. That is the basis of our statistical return. We put these together, and that and the ship's return form the basis. The ship's return would, of course, contain a complete list of everything that is on board, with the marks and so on.

155. Then I take it that your own men do not handle the meat at all?—No.

156. Nor have you any control over the inspectors?—No.

157. There are no inspectors appointed by the Customs?—No.

158. You have had great experience, of course, of the Merchandise Marks Act. Could you give us any general idea as to whether it has reduced or diminished the amount of imported goods in any year?—I do not think it has had any effect in reducing the importation.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

159. Sir Elliott Lees was asking you as to how the statistics were got. I suppose there is no kind of reason for anybody not making correct statements to you about the number of animals coming in?—No, I should think none whatever. That is our best security in a way.

160. So that there is every reason to suppose that the figures are correct?—I think so. I think one may take it that a thing like that is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROBERT HENRY REW, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

161. YOU are the secretary of the Central Chamber of Agriculture?—Yes.

162. Are there chambers of agriculture associated with the Central Chamber?—Yes,

Chairman—continued.

there are about 74 or 75 associated chambers throughout the country.

163. Do you represent them as well as the Central Chamber?—I represent the council of the

Chairman—continued.

the Central and the Associated Chambers of Agriculture on which all the associated Chambers are represented.

164. You have been secretary since 1890?—Yes.

165. And you were an Assistant Commissioner of the Royal Commission on Agriculture?—Yes.

166. Can you give us the general opinion of your council on this subject?—The opinion of the council has been frequently expressed in approval of the principle of this Bill, the Agricultural Produce Marks Bill. Without going too far back, I may perhaps quote the most recent resolutions on the subject. On the 11th of April 1893 the council passed the following resolution: "That this council approves of the principle of legislation to label all foreign and colonial meat as such." On 3rd April 1894, they passed the following resolution: "That this council approves the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the marking of foreign meat, and urges the President of the Board of Agriculture to introduce a Bill to give effect thereto." On the 2nd April 1895 they passed the following resolution: "That the recommendations of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the marking of foreign meat be passed into law. That the law prohibiting the sale of any foreign produce as English, whether by direct misrepresentation or by implication, be strengthened and vigorously enforced by the Government." That resolution was re-affirmed on 11th December 1895. On 31st March 1896 they passed a resolution approving of the principle of the Agricultural Produce Marks Bill, and on 6th April 1897 they passed a resolution approving of the Agricultural Produce Marks Bill of this Session, which is before this Committee.

167. Can you give me any information as to opinion of farmers throughout the country in reference to this Bill; have you any other evidence than the opinion of the representatives on the council?—I have a pretty good opportunity of knowing the general opinion of farmers throughout the country, not only in connection with the Central Chamber of Agriculture, but through my connection with the Royal Commission and in other ways; and, speaking generally, I think that the feeling of farmers is almost unanimously, if not quite unanimously, in favour of the principle of this Bill. A large amount of evidence which has been collected by the Royal Commission on Agriculture (I have examined it pretty carefully, and I know it pretty well) tends, I think, to support that statement.

168. Is that the case in regard to farmers in every part of the country?—I think so.

169. There is no class of agriculturists that you are aware of who are opposed to the principle of the Bill?—No class of agriculturists who are interested in the production of meat, in my opinion.

170. Have you had any opportunity of ascertaining the opinions of other classes of the community, or are we to get that from other witnesses?—I can only speak on behalf of agriculturists.

171. There was some evidence laid before the Royal Commission on Agriculture; I do not know whether there is any special point in that evidence which you think it desirable to bring before us?—No, I have just said what the general effect was; I can speak to that, having gone through the evidence pretty carefully, and I can say that the general effect is to support the statement which I have made, that the opinion of farmers is practically unanimous in favour of the Bill.

172. The evidence that you refer to as being laid before the Royal Commission on Agriculture was the evidence of farmers in favour of this Bill?—Yes; I thought it was hardly worth while taking extracts from the evidence.

173. Was there any evidenee given before the Royal Commission on Agriculture against the principle of this Bill?—I do not think so. Of course the evidence taken by the Commission was purely agricultural; almost exclusively.

174. I think you are in a position to give us some figures showing the increase in the importation of meat and cheese; can you give us any statistics with regard to the increase in the importation of meat?—Yes; I have taken out figures which are similar to those which I laid before the House of Lords Committee on the marking of foreign meat, which I have brought down to date, and I will hand in those tables if you please. Perhaps I may just give their general effect. The first table shows the average annual quantity of live meat, dead meat, and total meat respectively, imported into the United Kingdom, with the quantity per head of population worked out. It is in triennial periods, showing the average of the three years, commencing with the period 1867-8-9.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

175. Are these the figures in Appendix G. of the House of Lords Report?—Yes; the earlier figures are: I have simply brought the figures down to date; they appear on page 206.

Chairman.

176. With regard to the live meat imported, I see in that first period of 1867-8-9 the average per annum comes out at 60,300 tons?—That is so.

177. And casting my eye along the figures till I come to 1882-3-4, I find they gradually rise till the average for those years is 144,100 tons?—That is so.

178. As compared with 60,000, or more than double?—Yes.

179. Then there seems in 1885-6-7 to be a slight diminution?—Yes.

180. The figure is 126,700 as against 144,100?—Yes.

181. Is there any particular reason for that that you know of?—I am not quite sure offhand; but I think it was probably owing to legislation affecting the importation of animals at that particular moment; but I should not like to speak with confidence from memory.

182. Going on we then get to 1888-9-90. The average is 181,100?—Yes.

183. And in 1891-2-3 the average is 176,900?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

184. And in 1894–5–6 the average is 183,900?—Yes. May I be allowed to say with regard to the figures for live meat, of course the official returns only give the number of animals imported. They give the number of animals imported from different countries. There is a formula which has always been adopted in connection with these figures by everybody who has to deal with them, which is practically accepted for turning it into dead meat.

185. Probably the proportion will be the same?—Yes; they are worked out on entirely the same basis.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

186. Will you tell us what the formula is?—I am afraid I have not it with me.

Chairman.

187. But the proportions will be precisely the same as if you gave us the figures of the number?—Absolutely, yes.

188. The same formula is applied to all?—Yes.

189. Then the general result of that is that the live meat imported, comparing 1867 with 1896, is that in the latter triennial period the quantity is three times that of the former?—That is so.

190. And at the present time, 1894–5–6, the average is higher than anything of the previous years?—Yes.

191. Then with regard to dead meat imported in 1867–8–9 the average is 56,500 tons?—Yes.

192. And that also seems to have risen very steadily till in 1894–5–6 the average comes out at 598,900 tons?—Yes.

193. A very large increase?—Yes.

194. More than 10 times?—Yes.

195. Of course the total imported, taking dead meat and live meat together, gives the same practical result of a very large increase, mounting up from 116,800 in the first period to 782,800 in the latter period?—Yes.

196. Then have you worked out the rate per head?—I have worked out the rate per head of imported meat, and of imported dead meat separately; that is, of the total imported meat and of the imported dead meat separately per head of population, which is, of course, really a fairer way of testing the figures.

197. The first column is the rate per head of imported meat; that is, the total both live and dead?—That is the total. That is really the figures of the fourth column worked out on population.

198. Then that rate per head has increased from 8·5 lbs. per head of population, in 1867–8–9, to 44·8 lbs. per head in 1894–5–6?—Quite so.

199. And that seems to be a gradual increase too. Then the rate per head of imported dead meat has risen in the same period from 4·1 lbs. to 34·3 lbs.?—Yes.

200. In practically 30 years?—Yes.

201. It is pointed out, going back three triennial periods, the figures for 1888–9–90 are 36·1, and in 1891–2–3, 39·4, and the last three years, 44·8; so that there has been very little rise comparing the average of those

Chairman—continued.

three years, beginning 1891, with the three years beginning 1894?—That is so.

202. Then your next table refers to what?—The next table is one showing the total quantity and value, and the value per cwt. and per lb., of meat of different kinds imported during last year. Of course, Mr. Primrose has already given the Committee some particulars referring to last year, which are taken from the annual statement of trade. As a matter of fact, these figures have been worked out from the monthly trade and navigation accounts, which are the only data available until that volume is issued at this time of year.

203. They are the same figures?—They are the same subject to correction, and there are sometimes minor corrections.

204. Tell us what is the interesting point which you show by this?—The total amount of pig meat, including bacon, hams, and pork, imported during last year was 6,563,688 cwts., of a total value of 11,969,811*l.*, which works out at a value per cwt. of 1*l.* 16*s.* 5¾*d.*, and a value per lb. 4*d.* The total quantity of beef of all kinds was 3,308,248 cwts. of a value of 6,384,662*l.*

205. These values, I suppose, are the values declared at the Custom House?—Quite so. That would be a value per cwt. of 1*l.* 18*s.* 7*d.*, and a value per lb. of 4*d.* Then mutton: the importation was 3,018,009 cwts., of a value of 4,920,417*l.*, which works out at a value per cwt. of 1*l.* 12*s.* 7½*d.*, and per lb. 3½*d.* The meat unenumerated gives a total of 456,628 cwts., of a value of 1,073,775*l.*, being a value per cwt. of 2*l.* 7*s.* 0¼*d.*, and per lb. 5¼*d.*

206. Does that last amount include tinned meats?—It includes tinned meats, I believe.

207. And salted meat?—Salted beef you see is differently described; it is separately enumerated.

208. The unenumerated is what is not included in pig meat, or in beef, or in mutton, and it includes canned meat?—Yes.

209. Then your next, I believe, refers to cheese?—The next gives the total quantity and value per cwt. and per lb. of cheese imported during 1896, and in this case I give countries from which the cheese came.

210. The total quantity is 2,244,525 cwts.?—Yes.

211. And the great bulk of that seems to come from Canada, 1,234,297?—Yes.

212. And the total value is 4,900,342*l.*?—Yes.

213. And you work that out at a value per lb. 4¾*d.*?—Yes.

214. You do not give us any table showing the increase of cheese as you did in the case of meat?—No, I have not prepared that, but I might give perhaps very shortly the figures of cheese imports per head of population which would give the progression. I have a note of that here giving the cheese imports per head of population in quinquennial averages.

215. From what date?—From 1861–65. These figures are simply taken out of the agricultural returns.

216. Please give me the first one and the last one?—In 1861–65 it was 2·9 lbs. per head of population;

Chairman—continued.

population; in 1881–85 it was 6·3 lbs. per head of population.

217. Is the increase pretty continuous?—Yes, taking the periods it is progressive. If I might take the five-year periods they run in this way, beginning at the first: 1861–65 it is 2·9 lbs.; it goes to 3·4; 4·7; 5·7; 5·7; 5·8; 6·3. For 15 years you see the average was practically stationary. The increase in the case of cheese has been nothing like so great as in the matter of meat; in fact it has been comparatively small during the last 20 years.

Mr. *Doughty.*

218. Have you the values per pound?—For the year 1896.

Chairman.] For 1896; it is 4¾*d.* per pound.

Mr. *Doughty.*] And for 1892 it was 5¼*d.*, according to the published returns.

Chairman.

219. Perhaps you will make the same calculation for these quinquennial periods which you have done for 1896?—Yes.

220. Then I see you have made a note which had better be mentioned here. Consumption per head of cheese in the United Kingdom, and you estimate the home produce at 5·9 lbs., or practically 6 lbs. per head, and the foreign produce at 6·4 lbs., showing that the foreign produce is rather greater than the home produce?—Yes.

221. But in the first place you say that the home produce consumption has been estimated; can you give us an idea of how that estimate is arrived at?—I am afraid I am responsible for that myself. I went into the matter some four or five years ago for the purpose of a paper read before the Statistical Society, and from the best data which I could collect at the time I arrived at that figure as representing the average home produce.

222. Do you think that is accurate?—I should not, of course, take it if I could find a better; but it is practically the only one which has been made.

223. How did you estimate it?—I sent out a large number of circulars of inquiry to people throughout the country who were interested in the production of cheese and who were in any way likely to give information.

224. Whom did you ask; the retail dealers?—No, I attacked the problem rather from the point of view of the producer.

225. So that you tried to get what the producer made?—Yes, what the average production was. I went into the whole subject of what was done with the milk produced in the country, and therefore I had to allocate, of course, how much was sold as milk, how much was made into butter, and how much was made into cheese.

226. A very difficult estimate to make, I suppose, you will admit?—Yes; I do not profess to say that it is absolutely accurate or anything like it, but it is the best obtainable.

227. The foreign produce is very accurate, but these are the actual figures?—The foreign produce is, of course, the actual figures.

Chairman—continued.

228. Those, I think, are all the figures that you have to submit to us?—Yes, I think those are all the figures I have.

229. Can you give any evidence with regard to whether this imported meat and cheese is sold directly, and by misrepresentation as British?—I have no fresh evidence to lay before the Committee with regard to that, but I take it that that has been practically proved by the evidence which was laid before the Lords Committee on the marking of foreign meat.

230. Then you have nothing to add to what we shall find in the evidence there?—No, I have nothing to add. I would only point out that the evidence laid before the Committee apparently, from their report, convinced that Committee.

231. What year was that?—1893.

232. Have you any reason to suppose that that practice has increased during the last few years?—There is a very general impression, at least among those interested, that it goes on increasing, but I have no absolute evidence of that.

233. Of course the quantity has been increased that was brought into the country?—That is so.

234. All farmers are strongly of opinion that they are prejudiced by the existence of this misrepresentation?—Yes, they think that it causes injury to them, and that is the first point upon which they ask for legislation on this subject. The second is, I think, that with the importers of this meat they desire that all meat should be sold on its merits.

235. You tell us how they think that they are prejudiced: is it that the consumer would prefer to buy home-grown meat and cheese?—They think that there is a feeling among the purchasers of meat in favour of buying English meat if they can get it, and when they can get it.

236. At a higher price?—To a certain extent. But at any rate their view is that whatever the price may be the buyer as a rule would prefer to have British-grown meat.

237. As a matter of fact is home-grown meat sold at a higher price than the foreign meat?—Yes.

238. I am speaking of to the consumer you understand?—Yes.

239. And are the farmers under the idea that the consumer would give a higher price for the British meat if he were sure he would get it?—They think that he does so now in the belief that he gets it.

240. But then you said just now that foreign meat was sold at a lower price?—When it is sold openly it is sold at a lower price. The contention is that it is sold to a larger extent at a higher price as British.

241. At the British price?—And therefore, although the purchaser is prepared to give the higher price for British, he does not get the higher priced British, but the lower priced foreign. That is the argument.

242. You, I presume, have no evidence to give us of what the consumer thinks?—No, I do not profess to speak on behalf of the consumer, except perhaps that I might be allowed to point out that the general tendency of to-day, and of legislation passed by Parliament has been in the

Chairman—continued.

direction of giving every consumer the right of knowing exactly what he is buying.

243. Was there any evidence before the Lords' Committee from the consumers on that point?—I think there was evidence given on behalf of consumers, certainly there was some evidence given on behalf of people who had gone into butchers' shops and bought.

244. In the form of complaints, that they were satisfied that misrepresentations had taken place?—Yes.

245. And that they paid a higher price for a lower quality?—Yes.

246. Then with regard to another part of the Bill which refers to the registration or licensing of vendors of foreign meat. Do the farmers consider that that is of importance?—Yes. Farmers practically are in favour, in the first instance, of having foreign meat and cheese marked in some way. They are also in favour, that is to say that they have expressed an opinion in favour of similar provisions to those put into the Bill as to a register of dealers in foreign meat or cheese, and further, they are to a large extent in favour of it being provided that those who sell foreign meat should give some public notification of the fact to those who enter their premises by means of a sign or otherwise.

247. It is not intended by this registration, is it, that a man who is registered is to sell nothing but foreign meat?—No, I do not think that is contemplated in the Bill.

248. What is contemplated is that if a man sells nothing but home-grown meat he does not require to be registered?—Quite so.

249. But that if he wishes in conjunction with that trade also to sell foreign meat he shall be registered?—Yes.

250. And that it shall be publicly notified that he is a seller of foreign meat as well as of home-grown meat?—Yes, that is so.

251. Then your evidence is from those whom you represent both on the Council of the Central Chamber and from your own knowledge of the opinions of producers in this country of both meat and cheese, that they are strongly in favour of this Bill?—Yes, of some Bill embodying this principle. Perhaps I ought to say with regard to the Bill that the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and I believe farmers generally, would object to the omission from the Bill of foreign animals slaughtered at the port of landing; they consider that if foreign meat is to be marked at all the heading of foreign meat should include those animals which are landed alive and slaughtered at the port. As the Bill stands it is objectionable, because it practically divides all meat into two classes, one being called British and the other being called foreign, and it allows foreign meat which comes alive to be described as British, and it would practically give it a sort of legal certificate in the future as being British.

252. They object to the limiting words in Clause 15, "the words 'British or Foreign meat' mean meat killed within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man"?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

253. They object to those limiting words?—They consider that those words are too wide.

254. With regard to the other provisions of the Bill have your council carefully considered how far they think it a practical measure?—I cannot say that the council have gone into the matter in detail and I am not authorised to express their approval of every actual line of the Bill.

255. Is there any other point that the council have doubt about the wisdom of the Bill or the usefulness of it except the one you have mentioned?—That is the main point, in fact the only one that I know of.

256. They have not expressed any opinion that you can give us upon the other provisions of the Bill at all?—No.

257. Either strongly in favour of it or strongly against it?—Except, as I have said, in favour of the general principle.

258. But not the details?—Not the details.

Sir *Elliot Lees.*

259. You have a note giving us the total consumption of cheese in the country, home produce and foreign produce, have you got any figures showing that with respect to meat?—Tables were laid by the Board of Agriculture before the Lords' Committee dealing with that point. I have several times worked out myself similar calculations, and I should have laid them before this Committee, only I thought, probably, they would come from the Board of Agriculture. I shall be prepared to do so if the Committee do not get them in any other way.

Chairman.

260. Do you say you have a table that you could put in?—I have not it for the last year; it would require working out; but I have on previous occasions worked it out. Perhaps, I may be allowed to refer to page 202 of the House of Lords Report, which explains what I mean. That table was handed in by the Secretary of the Board of Agriculture. I would have prepared a similar table, only I thought, probably, the Committee might have it from some other source.

261. This is the proportion per cent. annually of the home production and the live animal and the imports?—You will see there are three heads on page 202. Home production, divided into beef and mutton. The result of that table is to show that the home production was 66·9 per cent. of the total, and the production from live imports was 8·4 per cent. of the total, and that the dead meat represented 24·7 per cent. of the whole total.

262. This is for the year 1892?—Yes.

263. And it produces this result that the home production of meat in all forms is 66·9?—Yes.

264. And if we take the live imports and the dead meat together it would be 33·1?—Quite so.

265 So that the foreign imports, including the live imports, is about one-third of the whole?—Yes. as nearly as possible, a third.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

266. The live imports are rather less than one-tenth of the whole?—Quite so.

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

267. Looking at your figures, the rate per head of live meat imported would amount to about 6 lbs. ?—In the period of 1894-95-96.

268. About 6 lbs. per head of the whole population ?—Yes.

269. Now you tell us that the farmers are generally in favour of some legislation of this kind ?—Yes.

270. Would that legislation be of any benefit to them unless it raised the price of meat ?—I do not think that quite follows; it would be a benefit to them if it prevented unfair competition with their produce. They consider that at the present moment they are prejudiced by this unfair competition. They think if that were removed it might not necessarily raise the price, but it would create a larger demand.

271. If that competition was removed there would necessarily be either less meat in the country, and the price must therefore be raised or there would be an increase of production in English meat ?—Yes.

272. I take it that wherever it pays to produce English meat at present prices it is produced ?—I do not know whether I should quite accept that proposition. It is a problem which involves so many conditions that I do not know that I can quite assent to that.

273. I take it that if a farmer is a wise man he would produce meat where it pays him to produce it ?—Yes, where it pays him at the moment better than any other produce.

274. And if by reducing foreign competition you create a larger production of English meat will that English meat be produced at the present prices ?—Yes. I think that it is quite possible that the production of meat might be increased at present prices in some circumstances, because of course competition in other departments of farm production is steadily increasing, and therefore year by year it may become profitable to produce meat where it is now not possible at a particular price ; it may be relatively profitable to produce it even at the same price although it is not now produced at that price.

275. Then you do not think that the reduction of the importation of meat into the country would necessarily raise the price of meat ?—I do not think that the provisions of this Bill would limit the importation of foreign meat.

276. That was not what I was asking ?—No, but if you will pardon me your question seemed to assume it.

277. I was merely asking the question. I did not found any argument upon it : I simply asked you whether you considered the reduction of imported meat to this country would necessarily raise the price of meat ?—If there was a marked reduction of foreign imports, no doubt.

278. You do not think the home supply could meet the demand without raising the price ?—I think the honourable Member is putting a purely hypothetical case.

279. Yes, purely ?—It certainly could not at once. It would, in course of time; things would tend to adjust themselves; but the first result of a forced limitation of foreign supply must necessarily be to raise the price.

280. I do not know whether you know anything as to the question of tuberculosis; has that come under your notice ?—Of course, I have not expert knowledge upon the subject, but I know something about it.

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

281. There has been a considerable loss to English dealers of meat from tuberculosis, has there not ?—Undoubtedly.

282. Is it within your knowledge whether there is more tuberculosis among English cattle than among foreign ?—No, it is, I should think, impossible that it should be within the knowledge of anyone, because, unfortunately, although there are very great facilities for detecting the existence of tuberculosis in English animals, there are practically none at all for detecting it in foreign animals, except, of course, as they come alive.

283. As far as the importation of live meat is concerned, there are facilities for detecting it ?—There are some facilities for detecting it, so far as it is possible.

284. There are absolute facilities ?—Yes, because they are slaughtered on the spot.

285. If it were ascertained that there was more tuberculosis among English cattle than among cattle alive, would it not tend to increase the use of live cattle imported to this country ?—At the present moment the farmers think that they are unfairly treated, with regard to tuberculosis.

286. That is not my question. If it were proved that there was more tuberculosis among English cattle than among cattle imported alive into this country, would it not tend to induce butchers, and retail dealers, and others, and the consumer generally to prefer meat so imported to English meat ?—Yes, it probably might, but you must forgive me for saying that I do not think that that is proved.

287. And if it did so, do you think that the Chamber of Agriculture would still be in favour of some process to enable that meat to be so distinguished ?—Yes. I think the position is that the English farmer thinks, rightly or wrongly, I at least think rightly, because it is a matter of fact that he produces the best meat and the best cheese in the world. I do not mean to say, of course, that all the meat and cheese which he produces is the best in the world, but that he does absolutely produce, in both departments, better meat and cheese than the producers of any other country. Then he thinks that if he can only secure absolutely fair play with regard to his produce, whatever the immediate result might be, in the long run he stands to win.

Chairman.

288. Does he anticipate a greater price for his article in the long run ?—No; I think he has given up anticipating a greater price for any of his produce.

289. Only increased demand ?—Only increased demand.

290. At present prices ?—Yes.

Mr. *Brigg.*

291. With regard to the figures which you have given of home production, beef and veal, mutton and lamb, and pig meat; have you any means

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

means of ascertaining those figures precisely. I am referring to Appendix D, on page 202 of the Report of the House of Lords Committee, which you spoke of just now?—The basis upon which those figures are constructed and that table has been made is in accordance with the formula which has been accepted by all who have had to deal with these matters; it is a well-known formula.

292. Are they taken from the agricultural returns?—The agricultural returns would only give the number of animals. Then you make your calculation based on the assumption that a certain number of animals of a certain class would give a certain quantity of meat.

293. And that is the only basis upon which these figures can be framed?—These figures upon which it is based are absolute, but all from that is more or less a matter of calculation and estimate.

294. In reply to the honourable Member who has just examined you, you have answered most of the other questions that I wish to have your opinion upon, but I have also two questions which you have partly answered already. One is why do the farmers want this Bill, and you have explained the reason in various ways; and my second question is, would this Bill, in your opinion, have the effect of raising the prices in the country, and you said you thought it would not?—I do not think, personally, it would have the effect of raising prices. It might, possibly, disturb prices slightly at first, but I do not think it would in the long run raise prices. I do not see why it should.

295. Not even if it were to diminish the quantity of foreign meat brought into the country?—I do not for a moment suppose that it would reduce the quantity of foreign meat brought into the country. Those who send foreign meat here evidently think that it would increase the quantity sent in because they are in favour of marking.

296. If you diminish the quantity of foreign meat sent here would not that have the effect of raising the price?—But I do not think this would have the effect of reducing the amount of foreign meat sent here.

297. In that case I do not quite see why the farmers in this country want the meat to be marked, except for the purpose of describing their own meat as being their own and foreign meat as being foreign meat?—They advocate it on the general principles of fair play, because they consider that a lot of foreign meat is now being sold under a false description.

298. I suppose at the bottom there would be some idea that it is to their real interest as well as the abstract idea of fair play?—Yes. I am not saying that they are pure philanthropists at all. But the commercial advantage which they reckon to gain is by the increased demand.

299. But increased demand necessarily means increased price?—Yes, that might be so at first; but any increased demand that would result from the operation of this Bill would be almost immediately made up by the increased home production to meet it.

300. Increased production at higher prices?—

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

No, because although, as you say, increased demand must at the moment necessarily involve a certain amount of rise of price, yet as soon as our production catches up the demand the prices will come down to the level again.

301. The honourable Member, in putting his questions, assumed that cattle are at present produced wherever they can be produced at a fair profit; the farmers suppose themselves wide awake enough upon that matter, and that they are making the best possible use they can of the position, and producing as much meat as they possibly can to pay at present prices, and, indeed, in some cases it is not paying. I do not wish to press the matter any further, because I think we have it all in a nutshell when you say that you do not expect pure philanthropy either on the part of the farmers or anybody else?—I am not for a moment putting that forward.

Mr. *Doughty*.

302. I think you told us there were 75 associated chambers of agriculture connected with the Central Chamber?—Yes.

303. How many are there in the country altogether?—I do not know of any that are not associated with the Central Chamber.

304. You think there are none outside?—Practically none.

305. You are the Central Board representing all the associations?—Yes.

306. You made some reference, in the early part of your evidence, to your being an assistant commissioner, and to the evidence given to the Royal Commission?—Yes.

307. I take it that evidence was not given with any particular regard to the principles of this Bill?—Not this particular Bill, of course.

308. But, as I understand, more in relation to the condition of agriculture in general?—Yes; but of course the witnesses called before that Commission were in most cases either ready with or were asked to make proposals as to any remedy or alleviations for the condition of things.

309. Are we to understand that the principle embodied in this Bill was the general remedy offered by the farmers to that Commission?—No; it was one amongst the remedies suggested.

310. With a view to increase the value of their stock?—No. It was one of a good many suggestions made by the farmer witnesses; and almost everyone who referred to the subject at all advocated the principle of this Bill before the Commission; that is to say, the principle of marking.

311. You say that the farmers suggested to the Commission that meat coming from abroad should be branded?—Yes; marked or branded in some way.

312. It is not necessary to ask you again for your reason why the farmers in the different chambers of agriculture desire the Bill, because, as I understand, you say they want absolute fair play?—Yes.

313. And they do not think they will be able to get fair play unless they have the meat branded?—No.

314. Would they think it a fair suggestion that

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

that they themselves should have English meat branded?—I should think they would be perfectly prepared to have their meat branded; but of course that would be an enormous undertaking. It would involve the establishment throughout the country of public abattoirs.

315. Does not it strike you that they do not seem to consider how much it will involve to have all foreign meat branded; if it is a question of fair play the matter of machinery is a secondary consideration, is it not?—I do not think that, as regards the matter of machinery, the two things are in the least comparable. It is comparatively a simple matter to mark foreign meat. If it were equally simple to mark English meat I think the farmers would infinitely prefer that course to be adopted.

316. I want to put before you the position of the foreign producers; you say you want absolutely fair play?—Yes.

317. Do you know, as a matter of fact, or have you heard, that there is a considerable amount of inferior English beef palmed off upon the public as foreign imported beef?—No, I do not know that.

318. You are not aware that in the market places of the country on Saturday nights very inferior English beef, old cows, and things of that kind are often sold as foreign beef?—I can quite imagine that it might be so, but I have no evidence of it at all.

319. If that were so, do you think the farmers would be in favour of marking their beef in order that the foreign producers might be protected against such unfair treatment as that?—I do not think they would object at all; I do not see why they should.

320. You think they would be in favour of the idea of everything they produced being marked as English?—If all meat was marked and sold on its merits I am sure they would agree.

321. You produced a lot of figures, but there is one set of figures which I should very much like to have, and perhaps we may be able to get them later on, and that is a statement of the comparative consumption of English beef during each period of five years, from the year 1869 down to the present time; could you get us such a statement?—That would involve a very large calculation.

Chairman.

322. We can get that information to some extent, if we get from Mr. Elliott for 1896 a similar return to that which we have in Appendix D. in the Report of the House of Lords Committee; is not that so?—Yes. It is given there for one year only.

323. That would practically give us the same figures; for instance, in 1892, you have here the proportion of home production given as 66·9. Then you have the produce of live imports and the imports of dead meat; that is what I understand the honourable Member suggests he would like to have for the quinquennial periods?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

324. What I wanted to see was this: has there been any diminution in the consumption of

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

English beef for this period during which there has been this great increase in the imports of foreign meat?—I see your point.

Chairman.

325. I suppose it is impossible to get the consumption directly. The only way we could approach consumption is by production?—Entirely; but, of course, that is practically sufficient, because there is no export of meat from this country.

326. When we have the figures for 1896 we should have, at all events, a comparison between 1892 and 1896; of course I could ask Mr. Elliott whether he could give us the figures for a longer period, as the honourable Member suggests; I understand he wishes to have the figures for the same period as we are having them for in regard to foreign meat; I will see whether it is possible to get those figures.

Mr. *Doughty.*

327. I should like to ask you upon another point bearing upon this, namely, as to the value of English beef; have you any knowledge whether English beef sold on the market to-day, notwithstanding all this foreign import, makes less than it made in 1865?—No, I should not like to speak as to that.

328. Is it less per pound now than during any period within the last 25 years?—I do not know; I should not like to give evidence upon that point.

329. That seems to be rather an important point, because if farmers are suffering through the importation of foreign meat, they can only suffer, of course, through the price their meat makes?—Yes.

330. You are not aware whether English beef was making more 10 years ago than it is making now?—No, I could not say. Of course it would not be fair in either case to take the price at any particular moment or in any particular year. You would have to take an average of three or five years in either case to show the true prices.

331. There is another matter I should like to ask about in regard to prices. You have given some figures here in regard to prices showing a figure for foreign meat 4½*d.* per lb. I understand you to say that those were taken from the returns supplied at the Custom House?—They are simply got by working out the quantity by the value. Both the quantity and the value are given in the returns issued by the Customs.

332. How is that arrived at; is not the price governed by supply and demand very largely?—As you know, the returns issued by the Customs give the quantity and the declared value. How far the declared value represents the absolute value, of course I cannot say, but I have no reason to suppose that it does not do so.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

333. Are you of opinion that this idea of marking meat originally arose from the assumption that foreign meat was being sold in this country as English meat?—Certainly.

334. The total importation of foreign meat in

Sir *John Kinloch*—continued.

the year according to your table here giving the years up to 1896, was 782,800 tons?—That was the total in one of the years.

335. How much of that do you consider has been sold in the country as English meat?—I am afraid it would be the wildest guess if I were to try to put a figure upon that.

336. You say that it is on the assumption that a large quantity of this foreign meat has been sold as English beef, that you advocate the marking of foreign meat, so you must have some data to go upon?—The data, as I have said, is contained, so far as I am concerned, in the evidence laid before the House of Lords Committee. Evidence was there given which convinced that Committee that a practice of selling foreign meat as English prevailed. To what extent it prevailed, it is I think impossible for me or for anybody to say.

337. The extent came out in the evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords. There was no guess as to what the amount was?—I do not see how it would be possible to give anything like a reliable estimate of it.

338. Then as regards the quality of foreign beef that is sold by butchers as English beef, I presume it must be very good in quality if the general public cannot tell the difference?—No doubt a lot of it is of good quality, but as I understand it, from what I have seen on the subject, a man who is professedly always selling English meat of the best quality would now and again sell a certain quantity of foreign meat. I do not suppose for a moment that that is the usual practice of the trade, but just as there are black sheep in every flock, so among butchers there are certain individuals who may do this sort of thing; that is to say, that a man who professes always to sell good English meat of the best quality may, under certain conditions, owing perhaps to difficulties of getting an English supply, or something of that sort, get a few carcases of foreign meat of the best quality, and sell them and palm them off on his customers who do not know the difference, as English meat. It does not follow that the particular joints supplied to the customers are equal in quality to what they usually get, but unless the butcher continues to do this for a time, they would not be likely to make a complaint or to detect the difference.

339. What is the British farmer selling his best meat at per cwt., at the present moment?—I have not got the figures at the moment; I could get them for you.

340. Do you know what foreign meat is sold at per cwt.?—I have not got any figures at the moment, I am sorry to say.

341. There is a considerable difference in price per cwt., I suppose?—Yes.

342. This foreign meat which the butcher sells as home beef is levelled up to the price of the other, I suppose?—Yes; when it is sold as English.

343. If this idea is carried out of marking foreign beef and the public found that this foreign beef could be sold at 4*d.* a lb. cheaper than we can produce it at, are they not likely to go and buy large quantities of that cheaper beef?—If it were of equal quality, no doubt they would.

344. Or if it were of fairly good quality?—There are of course a great many facilities now for people who prefer foreign meat to get it at its legitimate price, and that is perfectly right and proper; nobody wants to interfere with that; that is not a trade that we wish in the least to interfere with.

345. You see what I mean; I am afraid of our beef being reduced in price or brought down towards the level of the price of foreign beef if the public find that as good?—Quite so. I am aware that there has been a good deal of solicitude expressed on behalf of the farmers, that by asking for this legislation they are doing themselves an injury instead of a benefit. All I can say to that is, that so far as I know the opinion of the farmers, they are willing to take that risk.

346. But you acknowledge that there is a certain amount of risk?—There might be a certain amount of risk in certain cases; that is to say, supposing foreign meat of good quality came into competition at a lower price with English meat of the same quality, it is obvious, of course, that the tendency would be to reduce the price of that English meat.

347. I suppose you are aware that farmers are now producing meat at the very lowest price at which they can profitably do so?—Yes, generally speaking, certainly.

348. It would be a very serious matter for the farmer if the price went down 2*d.* or 3*d.* a lb., so as to compete with the price of foreign meat?—Yes.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

349. I gather that in your opinion the quality of foreign meat is so little inferior to the quality of the home-grown article, that consumers could hardly be expected to discriminate between them?—I did not say that; what I said was that there was a certain proportion of the foreign meat which comes in, which is, no doubt, of very high quality; but I should not like to say that that applies to anything like the whole amount.

350. But have we not a certain inferior quality of British meat?—Undoubtedly there is inferior British meat produced.

351. Do you think that the marking of meat would reduce in any way the foreign supply?—I do not think it would in the long run reduce the foreign supply.

352. Would it tend to increase the price of the home article?—I do not think it would permanently increase the price of the home article.

353. Have you given any consideration to the great amount of trouble and inconvenience it would be to traders to have the duty of marking imposed upon them?—In my view, it should not be imposed upon the traders at all. It seems to me, it is very easy to discriminate between the two classes of foreign meat, that which comes in alive, and that which comes in dead. I think the duty of marking the dead meat should be imposed upon those who ship it. An honourable Member said that it was an enormous undertaking; but, of course, all meat that

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

that is shipped dead to this country must be collected, and the conditions under which it is dealt with render it comparatively easy to mark it before it is shipped. Of course, that does not apply to meat sent here alive, but then, it seems to me, that it would not be a very large undertaking if it was laid down that all the meat killed at Deptford, and Birkenhead, for instance, after being slaughtered, should be marked before it left the lairage.

354. You think you would not be running any risk of making a market for foreign meat by doing this?—I think the figures show that there is a very good market for foreign meat now.

355. You are not of opinion that it would make any difference if marking were carried out?—We think it would make a difference in favour of the English producers.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

356. Some questions have been put to you rather with the idea that the effect of this Bill would be to reduce the amount of foreign meat sent into this country. Do you not rather think that the reduction would be not in the foreign competition but in the system of selling foreign meat as English?—That is my opinion.

357. Do you consider that obviously the Bill is intended simply to insure that farmers and consumers should be less victims of fraud than has been the case up to now, and is the case now?—I think the principle of the Bill would insure that.

358. A question was put to you as to whether the importation of live stock was prohibited, because there was so much less disease in foreign cattle and in foreign countries than in English-grown cattle?—I think it would be absurd to suggest that. The reason why animals are not allowed to come into this country without being slaughtered at the place of importation is because of the risk of introducing disease.

359. Because there was a fear of their bringing disease into the flocks and herds of the English farmer?—Yes. Undoubtedly there is no country in the world so free from disease, generally speaking, as Great Britain.

360. Some questions were put to you with regard to this proposal being calculated to increase the price of meat all through the country; would you not rather consider that if after this Bill were passed into law foreign meat which is now sold as English were sold as foreign, the effect would be on the contrary to increase the amount of cheap meat which is bought by the poor instead of increasing the prices of this cheaper class of meat; that is to say, if the facilities for selling this foreign meat were decreased, and it was sold at the prices at which it would be worth if sold as foreign meat, would you not consider that the effect would be rather to keep down the price for the poor who buy this class of meat, rather than to put it up?—Yes, I think so. I think the effect would undoubtedly be in favour of the consumer.

361. And in favour of the poor-man consumer who will, probably, under this Bill get his foreign meat if he wishes to have it at a cheaper

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

price than he does under the present law?—Yes, certainly.

362. Then, practically, your opinion is that if there was any increased price it would be increased price as regards the better class of meat which is produced in this country?—Yes.

363. I ask the question because questions were put to you as to why the farmers should be in favour of this Bill; I take it that your opinion would be that they would be in favour of this Bill, because they would not have in competition with them an article which has hitherto been sold in the market as purporting to be meat grown by English farmers, whereas it is in reality foreign meat; it would take away the unfair competition (fraudulent competition I may call it) which exists at the present moment?—Yes. The farmers are perfectly prepared to meet foreign competition when it is quite fair, but not when it is unfair.

364. With regard to the expense of marking, I think a question was put to you rather suggesting that, instead of compelling the foreigner to mark his meat, the English producer should mark his meat?—Yes.

365. Having regard to the fact that, according to these returns, 68 per cent. of the meat is English-produced meat, and only 32 per cent. is foreign-produced meat, would you consider that it would be more economical to mark the smaller quantity, the foreign meat, the 32 per cent., than to mark the 68 per cent.?—Yes; it is entirely upon that ground, as I say, that this proposal is made to mark the foreign meat. It is not because there would be any objection on the part of the English producers to have their meat marked.

366. But simply as a matter of economy?—Quite so.

367. Some questions were put to you about the farmers; speaking from your knowledge of the farmers in regard to the suggestion that has been made of marking British meat to protect the foreigner from this fraud which they say is placed upon the foreigner by selling bad English meat as foreign meat, I suppose a farmer in this country would not consider that it was quite his duty to protect the foreigner by having English meat marked, would he?—No, perhaps not; but, as I say, my own personal opinion always has been that, if it were possible, it would be far better to mark all British meat, and let the foreign meat take its chance; but it is out of the question to entertain such an idea; it is an impracticable proposal.

368. You were asked as to whether English meat was not less per pound now than it used to be years ago. I think you have your tables here under which we can see the amount of foreign meat which is imported into this country. If foreign meat is sold as English meat, would the price at which it would be sold be less or more than that of English meat, in your opinion?—It would be less.

369. That is to say if the retailer can obtain his meat at the prices at which we see from these returns, he can at the docks, namely, fresh beef at 4½*d.*, it would pay him probably better to buy that meat than to buy meat from the farmer at

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

6*d.*; he would be able to make a larger profit by doing so?—Yes.

370. And if there is no law against his doing so, he might turn round and say there is nothing fraudulent in doing that?—Yes, but I should doubt whether anybody does it without some idea that it is not quite the right thing to do.

371. But we know it has been done, and is done?—There is evidence to show that it has been done; it has been, I think, admitted on all hands, that the practice does prevail to some extent.

372. You were asked as to the exact amount of foreign meat sold as English meat. When that is done, is not such meat necessarily sold surreptitiously; when a man sells foreign meat as English meat he does not put up openly in his shop that what he is selling as English meat really comes from abroad?—Of course not.

373. Then is it possible for you or anyone to say how much of this foreign meat is sold as English meat?—It would be absolutely impossible. I have dabbled in statistics a little myself, and statisticians will sometimes attempt almost impossible things, but I think it would be an absolute absurdity for anybody to attempt to give anything but the wildest guess at such a problem as that.

374. A question was asked you with regard to foreign meat being so good that the public do not know the difference between it and English meat; is it your opinion that the English public are such connoisseurs of meat that they would be likely in the majority of cases to detect the difference when the meat was placed before them?—No, I do not think they would. As I say, I understand the usual way in which such a thing is carried out is for the two supplies to be mixed; that is to say, a person in the ordinary course of trade gets different qualities of joints from time to time, and he may occasionally make a complaint about it; and he may sometimes get a joint of foreign meat without noticing it, but I do not imagine he is all the time fed on foreign meat when he thinks he is getting English meat.

375. Is it your opinion, therefore, that it is impossible for any man in the country to say how far what I may call this fraudulent trade is being carried on?—Quite impossible.

Chairman.

376. Do you not think that the great bulk of the foreign meat that is sold is sold without any misrepresentation, that is to say, the customer does not ask specially what the meat is?—I should say there is practically very little sold with direct misrepresentation.

377. But is there any misrepresentation or fraudulent intention on the part of a man providing foreign meat, and selling it to his customer, where he does not represent it to be English meat, and where the purchaser chooses to take it without asking for English meat, or anything of that sort?—I think in many cases a man sets himself up to supply only English meat practically.

Chairman—continued.

378. I am not speaking of those cases, but is not the great bulk of this trade carried on by ordinary butchers, who have meat in their shop there, and do not pretend to say what the meat is, and the customers do not ask; is it not the case that the great majority of customers never ask whether it is foreign meat or English meat?—Quite so, but I think the customer in those cases is generally under the happy delusion that he is getting English meat.

379. Do you think that the great mass of the population care whether it is foreign meat or home-grown meat that they get, as long as they like it?—No, I should say, speaking of the great mass, they probably do not.

380. Do they not go by the price much more than by anything else, provided they get meat that they consider to be of sufficiently good quality?—Yes, but I should think there is a considerable class in the community who do care for it to some extent.

381. Is it not the general practice of those who do not like the meat that their butcher sends them either to bear it, which is perhaps the most usual case, or to make a complaint, or change their butcher?—Yes.

382. I do not suppose it would meet the case to ask whether it is foreign meat or home-grown meat; they look rather at the price, provided they get meat they consider sufficiently good?—But as a consumer I should very much object to being supplied with an article which I knew I could buy for something less if the butcher sold it to me fairly.

383. I am not speaking of a case of fraud, where, for instance, you ask for Scotch mutton, and the butcher sells you something which is not Scotch meat at all?—I think a large class of the community, though they may not explicitly ask for English meat, go on the assumption that they are getting it.

384. Have you with you that formula for turning the number of cattle into tons?—I have not got it with me, but I could easily send it to you.

385. It would perhaps be useful to us if you would do so. I suppose it is a formula for sheep, cattle, and pigs separately?—Yes; of course, it is only very rough.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

386. You have spoken of the impossibility of ascertaining how much of this foreign meat is, as we may call it, put fraudulently upon the market; but in your evidence, when I was cross-examining you, I think you said that there were certain shops in the country which professedly sold nothing but foreign meat: therefore it could be easily ascertained, I presume, how much foreign meat goes to those shops, and then the balance would be the meat sold in this way that the farmers complain of?—I do not see how you can ascertain that.

387. You mean you could not ascertain how much foreign meat was sold at those shops?—No.

Mr. ARTHUR F. JEFFREYS (a Member of the House), Examined.

Chairman.

388. YOU are good enough to come before the Committee to give some information with regard to the way in which meat is marked in foreign countries; I do not know whether you are going to confine yourself to Belgium, or whether you have any information with regard to other countries?—I have information with regard to other countries, but I have seen this marking done in Belgium, and therefore I would sooner restrict myself to Belgium.

389. Will you kindly take Belgium first; is it the case that all meat exposed for sale in Belgium must be stamped?—Yes.

390. That is for internal purposes?—All food that is either killed or exposed for sale in Belgium is to be stamped.

391. What is the purpose of stamping?—It has a double purpose; first of all, to show the origin of the meat, and next to show that it has been passed as sound by the inspector.

392. With regard to the first point, they mark the imported meat in order to show its origin?—Yes.

393. Is it marked in a special way?—In a special way.

394. In a different way from the meat which is home-grown?—Yes.

395. So that they have more than one mark?—Yes.

396. Perhaps you will be good enough to describe the process?—The abattoirs in Belgium, I may say, are not private abattoirs as we have here, but they are all Government abattoirs. There is a particular stamp for meat killed in the abattoirs in Brussels or in the large towns; there is another particular stamp in the places where the meat is received at Brussels from the provinces; and there is another particular stamp for meat that is imported from abroad that comes into the ports, such as Antwerp and the other ports. So that when you see the meat hanging up in the shop, by looking at the particular stamp on it you can at once tell whether it is meat killed in the town, whether it is meat killed in the provinces, or whether it is imported meat. Perhaps I need not go into the other point (though it is a very important point), that these stamps are never fixed on the meat unless it has previously been examined and passed as sound by an inspector.

397. Can you give us an idea of how these various kinds of stamps are put on?—Yes, I have seen it done as regards each of the three classes. As regards animals killed in the abattoirs at Brussels, after they are killed they are hung up in certain chambers. The inspector then goes round with his assistants, and he examines the meat, somewhat cursorily I am bound to say, but still he examines it very quickly, and he can tell at once, by looking at the inside of the animals, whether they are sound or not. He goes through and tells his assistants to stamp it. If it is a bullock it is stamped in six places on the carcase, three on each side. If it happens to be a sheep, it is stamped on each of

Chairman—continued.

the four quarters; if it happens to be a pig, it is, again, stamped upon each of the four quarters. I may say it is an impressed stamp; it is somewhat similar to the stamp we affix to letters. I have got an impression of it here (*handing the same to the Chairman*).

398. Is that the full size of the stamp?—Yes, this is it with the stamp (*producing a specimen*).

399. That is the full size?—That is the impression which is made upon the carcase. That would be repeated six times upon the carcases of cattle. I have sometimes heard it suggested that it would be a great trouble stamping the carcases, but I can assure you I have seen them stamped in an incredibly short space of time, quite as easily as Members of the Committee have seen postmasters stamping letters. The men stamp these six stamps upon the carcase very quickly indeed. In some of the towns other marks are placed upon joints as well. The only difference between these three marks is, that the first is the one put on at the Brussels abattoir; at the Halle Centrale, where they receive the meat, the meat is marked with a number "1," if it is meat which has come from the provinces; and in the centre of the stamp there is a number "2," if it is imported meat. There is a certain difference in the stamps, but it is a very small alteration, and the stamp is affixed in an incredibly short space of time.

Mr. *Brigg.*

400. You said the joints in other places were also stamped; how is that done; who is responsible for the stamping of the article after it has been further disjointed?—The municipality.

Chairman.

401. It is a Government official who stamps in the first instance?—Yes; that is to say, it is a Government official in certain places, and it is the inspectors under the municipalities in the various towns.

402. It is an official always?—An official always. Sometimes I have heard it said that the mark can be washed out, but that is not the case; the only way of erasing the mark is to cut it out, and there are very severe penalties for tampering with the marks; but so strong is the ink with which this impression is made, that I have seen bacon that has been cooked with the impression of the stamp still on the rind.

Mr. *Brigg.*

403. With regard to country places, it is most important as to how the marking is continued after the carcase is separated and distributed in shops and small retail places. I understand that the disjointed pieces of the carcase are still further marked additionally?—Yes; because a great quantity of the meat imported, especially from Algeria, comes in in joints. Quantities of meat that come from Algeria and other places,

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

sheep, for instance, come in cut up. Some of the meat is not worth sending; but the legs of mutton and saddles of mutton are worth sending, and they send them to Belgium as joints, and those are all marked.

404. In that case they would get the mark when they are imported?—Yes, at the port.

405. Is there any other marking authority in the country besides this; one which marks them with the Government mark at the port?—Yes; every municipality has its own inspector and also impresses whatever marks it likes on the different joints.

406. In addition to the first stamping?—Yes.

Chairman.

407. Supposing a carcase is marked at Brussels, and then goes into the country and is cut up into sirloins and so on, do the municipality put their mark on each joint?—Yes, they have full power to do so.

408. They may or may not?—Yes, they generally do.

409. Do they go so far as to have a mutton chop marked?—No. But I have seen them marked in the shops. The fact is, the butchers rather like the marking of the meat, and the consumers like it because it is not only that its place of origin is impressed upon it, but its soundness is guaranteed. That is why they like to see the mark.

Mr. *Brigg.*

410. What is the avowed object of the stamping?—There are two purposes, as I said: the first is to show its place of origin. A consumer goes into a shop in Brussels, we will say, and sees that stamp of the abattoir of Brussels, and then he thinks that is the best meat he can get; he knows that it is freshly killed, because he sees from the mark that it is killed in the town, and has not come in. Then he looks at meat marked with the second stamp, and sees it is killed in the provinces; and he looks at the third stamp and sees it is imported meat. The price is regulated accordingly, and the consumer chooses which he likes.

Chairman.

411. Is there a penalty if the butcher himself attempts to mark the meat?—Yes, a very severe penalty.

412. It is not intended that he should mark it, and there is a penalty if he does?—It can only be done under the municipality. They appoint and pay a regular inspector for doing this in every town.

413. I suppose the main reason for their doing it is to guarantee the soundness of the meat?—That may be a reason.

414. However, they have the origin shown as well?—Yes.

415. That is distinctly marked?—Yes.

416. So that they have that in their mind?—Everybody who can read can see the place of origin; and even those who cannot read know the mark so well that they can detect at once the place of origin.

417. These marks, you say, are indelible?—

Chairman—continued.

Quite; they can only be cut out. Even when a piece of meat like bacon has been roasted, you can see the mark still on the rind.

418. They do not in Belgium brand in any way?—No.

419. They mark with an ink-mark?—Yes.

420. Do you know whether, in other countries, branding has been adopted?—I believe it has been tried in some parts. In Norway and Sweden, I believe, it is a stamp; something similar to that at Brussels.

421. And what is it in Denmark?—I am not quite sure as to Denmark.

422. Do you know how many countries on the Continent do mark their meat?—Most countries have some kind of mark, except France.

423. Has Germany a mark?—Germany has a mark.

424. Do they mark those in very much the same way?—Yes, but it is not carried out in such an elaborate way as in Belgium.

425. But your impression is that the municipality there have the power to mark?—Yes, they have the power to mark.

426. Do they mark it in France?—I do not think they do so in France.

Mr. *Doughty.*

427. What is the object of marking in Germany; is it to insure good meat?—I think, again, it is a double object; not only to show the place of origin, but also the sanitary object, to insure that it is sound meat; that is particularly necessary, of course, in the case of swine.

Mr. *Brigg.*

428. The quantity of meat consumed in Belgium is very much smaller per head than in this country, is it not?—I think it is. Of course, as you know, Belgium is a very densely-populated country, but they are not quite so much a meat-eating people as we are.

Chairman.

429. I see from the figures you have given me the quantity killed weekly in the Government abattoir at Brussels is 2,000 pigs, 2,500 sheep, and 354 oxen?—Yes, that is at one abattoir.

430. I understand the condemned meat is destroyed?—It is destroyed at once.

431. Is it destroyed only on the ground of its being unsound meat?—Yes.

432. So far as its origin is concerned, it is not condemned at all, but they simply stamp the mark of where it comes from?—No meat can come into the country without being stamped. The stamp is put on the various joints or carcases at the port where the meat is entered; it is Antwerp generally. Any meat that is detected without a stamp is at once seized.

433. If it comes across the borders by land is there some arrangement for stamping it?—Yes; if it comes across the borders by land it has to be taken into one of these places called a halle centrale, and be inspected there and stamped.

434. Has that had an effect in destroying bad meat?—The fact is that there is a great deal of foot-and-mouth disease amongst the animals in Belgium; they do not take such care in trying to

Chairman—continued.

to eradicate the disease as we do, because it is not a country for breeding flocks and herds, they import a good deal of their meat.

435. Do I understand you have some evidence that the meat has been very much sounder since this system was adopted?—Certainly, as regards the meat that is sold.

436. You have some evidence as regards that?—Yes, from the burgomaster; I have not got his actual notes here, but when he showed me over the abattoirs, he said: "Since this Act has been in force, and since our meat has been inspected, there is less diseased meat brought in."

437. How long has it been in force in Belgium?—For some years now. I saw it in 1895, but although the abattoirs had then been only recently built, I think the system of meat marking had been in force for some years.

438. For 10 years, should you say?—For 10 or 12 years, I should think; but not in such an elaborate way. Now there is no chance of any sound meat being exposed for sale in a butcher's shop in Belgium, which is not marked. I ought also to say that the expense of this marking is very small indeed. It was almost incredible the amount of meat which the two inspectors and their assistants inspected and stamped.

439. Of course the expense and difficulty is minimised very much by these municipal abattoirs?—That is so.

440. Supposing this system was carried out in this country, of marking foreign imported meat, do you think that ought to be done at the port of importation?—Certainly, because if it was done at the port where it is landed, it can be done at a much smaller expense. If you get a lot of imported meat, either in London or elsewhere, the man who stamps it there can do it so rapidly that it lessens the expense; but if it is disseminated throughout the country, and you have a particular man going to stamp a few sheep in one town, and then a few in another, that adds to the expense very much.

441. Do I gather that your suggestion would be that the Custom House authority or some official should do this marking?—Yes. I would have all the carcases, for instance, landed here in the Thames in the port of London, stamped in the same way as they do at Brussels, with an impressed stamp, exactly as they stamp the letters that are received at a post office.

442. There is nothing in the Bill that would lead you to suppose that that was the suggestion of the Bill?—No; because in the schedule of the Bill the marking is left according to the discretion of the Board of Agriculture. The Board of Agriculture are to lay down certain rules by which the meat should be marked.

443. Then I rather gather that the intention is that there should be an official marking, and that it would not be, as we have perhaps been considering before, that the exporter should take care that it is marked before it comes here?—I think it ought to be officially marked because it would be much more certain of being marked if the duty is left with officials; of course, it might be marked at the place where the meat was imported for the exporter's own sake, to show that it was New Zealand mutton, which they consider much better than Argentine, or something of that kind.

444. Is there any provision in the Bill which shows that it is intended also that when the carcases are cut up and go into the country, the marking should be done again on the small piece of meat?—That also is left to the Board of Agriculture. It was thought by the promoters of the Bill that going into these details in the Bill before the House of Commons was hardly necessary, it was thought best to leave that to the Government Department.

445. In that case it is the authorities under the Public Health Act, the sanitary authority, which you indicate as the authority which probably would take charge of that?—Yes, that is what I hope, because if this marking were done under the sanitary authority, if any bad meat were detected, it would be at once seized. At the present time, of course, it is known that there are certain sanitary inspectors who go through the markets, but they do not see every joint of bad meat. To my knowledge a great many animals which are unsound are killed, but the meat is not inspected, it is very much a matter of chance whether the sanitary inspector catches it or not.

Mr. *Brigg.*

446. The inspector only inspects, does he not, if he is informed?—Just as he is informed, or happens to see the meat.

Chairman.

447. Do you think there will be any difficulty in this respect; under the Bill the person we make responsible is the person who deals in or sells, or offers or exposes for sale, any foreign meat that is not marked. In a country town, for instance, where the sanitary authority was bound to mark, if they neglected to mark you put the responsibility, not upon the official who does not mark, but upon someone else, the butcher, who may be innocent; do you think there would be any difficulty in that?—I do not think so, because nearly all the meat exposed for sale in provincial towns is home-killed meat. If it is not home-killed meat, but is foreign imported meat, it comes down in carcases, which can be more easily detected than when they are cut up and exposed for sale, as in the London shops.

448. Of course the registration would help that, because the sanitary authority would know what shops to go to do their duty?—Yes. From my experience I should not say that a great deal of foreign meat was sold in the provincial towns, I mean in rural towns; I think it is chiefly in the large towns that foreign meat would be sold.

Mr. *Brigg.*

449. In the manufacturing towns it is a great institution, is it not?—Yes, but I did not mean such towns as those.

450. In the large towns, where a cargo of meat comes into the hands of a wholesale dealer, he would have to give notice every time to get an official to come round, would he not?—No,

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

because, according to my idea, the meat would be marked at the port of debarcation.

451. I was rather following it into the more detailed arrangements of the municipalities, which you described to us in Belgium, in regard to the smaller pieces?—That would be only in the case of a general marking coming into force.

452. I assume it is marked at the port of debarcation; but if you attempt to follow it when that carcase goes out and is cut up into various joints, and the rules under the schedule provide that there must be a marking of these small joints, then when the butcher got a carcase and had it cut up, he would have to get an official to come and mark those separate joints, would he not?—Yes; but I imagine that power would only be exercised if it was thought that a man was selling the meat fraudulently.

453. You do not quite look forward to carrying out the system quite so much in detail as it is in Belgium?—No, not in such an elaborate way.

454. You would be satisfied, at any rate at the beginning, with marking at the port of debarcation?—Certainly, because in a butcher's shop almost invariably with regard to sheep the carcase is hung up, and most people can detect the difference between a frozen carcase and a home-killed carcase in that case.

455. Of course the butcher would be able to sell mutton chops and the smaller joints of the foreign meat as English meat?—He might. You cannot stop those small frauds, but you would be able to stop it generally.

456. Of course, the mere fact of its being against the law would act as a deterrent?—Certainly.

457. I understand, from your replies to the Chairman, that you do not contemplate in this Bill to follow the meat beyond the port of importation with such marking as may be there deemed to be necessary there?—That is so.

458. That simplifies it very much?—I have always thought that if you tried to follow it further, not only would there be great trouble and difficulty, but enormous expense; whereas stamping the meat, as I have described, at the port of debarcation, is a very simple and a very inexpensive process.

Mr. *Doughty*.

459. Are you sure it is a simple and inexpensive process?—Yes; from the information given to me. I see I have not put down on my notes the inspector's salary; I was called rather suddenly to give evidence before this Committee, and I have not brought the information with me; but, I may say, I was quite astonished at the very small cost of stamping the meat in Brussels.

460. Of course, you are aware that all dead meat coming into the country comes covered with sheets?—Yes.

461. In order to stamp as you suggest, I suppose the sheets would have to be removed?—No, I do not think so.

462. Do you think you could stamp through the sheet?—Yes, it is a very thin covering of

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

linen that covers the carcases. I think this ink would go through that covering.

463. We have been told this morning of a cargo of 90,000 sheep landed last week in London; do you not think that the marking of 90,000 carcases four times, or six times, as you suggest, would be a process which would take a considerable amount of time?—No, I do not, judging from what I saw at Brussels.

464. Of course, Brussels and London are very different places?—Yes; but I do not propose to stamp the whole of the meat we consume here. I only propose stamping the imported meat, which is a comparatively small amount.

465. It represents over 500,000 tons, does it not, in the year?—That is quite true.

466. When you look at it in that light, it seems to me to be a question of very great difficulty to stamp a quantity like that?—I do not think you would find it very difficult, because they are all handled separately. It is not as if these carcases were all packed in bulk. Each carcase is handed out in a separate way, and the act of stamping them as they come out would not take a great amount of time.

467. If the importers themselves were required by the Act to stamp, and if there were a penalty if they did not do so, would not that meet the case?—I think that would be a very good thing, and I have reason to believe they would be very glad to stamp their meat, because, when I introduced a similar Bill some years ago, I had a letter from a gentleman in New Zealand, who was a perfect stranger to me, who said, he was very glad I had introduced such a measure, because he was quite sure his mutton ought to be stamped, because it was often sold as English mutton to the detriment to his own mutton.

Mr. *Brigg*.

468. Have you any suggestion to make as to registration?—In the Bill the registration was put in in order to detect fraud. We think that if the marking were done systematically, as it is in Belgium, then there really would be no need of registration at all, because every bit of meat would be marked. But in a case of this kind, where only foreign meat is to be marked, then naturally you have this registration to keep a further check upon fraud.

469. There would be some expense and trouble, would there not, in regard to the register that would fall upon the municipalities?—That is true; it would be a small cost.

Chairman.

470. Have you anything further which you wish to add?—With regard to the imported meat that is killed at the ports, it has often been said that that meat is sold as English, and no doubt it is. I daresay it is common knowledge that the fresh meat, as it is called, that is consumed by our troops, is almost invariably imported animals which are killed at the ports. Our troops do not eat our home-grown meat, but they eat this meat, which comes alive to the ports and is killed at Deptford and other places, which is very much cheaper.

It

Chairman—continued.

It has been often asked why in the present Bill which is different from the first Bill it is omitted to make it compulsory to have that meat marked; it was done in deference to the feelings of certain people at Deptford and Birkenhead and other places, who said that it would injure their trade very much; but taking Brussels as an example, I cannot see how it would injure their trade to have the meat marked, because if that meat were marked with a different mark to the frozen meat it would merely show that that meat came from abroad but was fresh meat killed at the port. It is not so good as our prime meat, and therefore it ought to be at a lower price; it is an intermediate stage between frozen meat and prime meat killed here.

Mr. *Brigg.*

471. That is dropped out in this Bill, you say?—It was left out in deference to the feelings of certain employers of labour, and so on, at the different ports; but I do not think it would be a hardship even if it were put in.

Chairman.

472. It is quite right to mention that, because of course it is open to the Committee in going through the Bill to amend it in that way if they thought it a desirable or harmless amendment?—I only mention it because I maintain that it is more in the interests of the consumer that that meat should be marked than of anybody else. It is very good meat; there is no denying that; but it is not prime meat, and whereas you would have to pay 10*d.* or 11*d.* per pound for our prime meat, you ought to get that meat which is very good fresh meat for 7*d.* or 8*d.* If this mark were upon it you would at once have the three different grades of meat distinguished; you would either buy frozen meat at 5*d.*, this other meat at 8*d.*, or a prime joint of our meat at 10½*d.*

473. There would be no necessity for marking home-grown meat?—None at all.

Chairman—continued.

474. In fact, instead of the Brussels system of three marks you would do with two?—Yes.

475. That is to say, the frozen meat and the cattle killed at the port?—Yes.

476. You would distinguish by the mark between those two so that the public would see the difference?—Yes.

477. Then the meat that was not marked would be home-grown meat?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

478. Do I understand you to say that the Government feed the troops with foreign meat?—They do. The provision is generally that 60 per cent. of the meat shall be fresh and 40 per cent. frozen; but instead of the 60 per cent. being our prime English meat it is almost invariably this meat that is killed at the ports; it is fresh meat, but it is killed at the ports. That is merely a question of expense.

479. You are aware, of course, that the farmers are as strongly opposed to this meat that is killed at the ports as they are to the frozen meat?—They complain that it unfairly competes with their trade. I never yet found a farmer who complained of that meat coming in, but they complain that it is sold for their meat. For instance, very often it is the case, I believe, with some of this meat if the cattle come in in a better condition than usual it is sold as prime Aberdeen. Of course that is a fraud; it may take in a few people, but it is a fraud. Instead of being worth the full price of prime Aberdeen oxen it ought to be about two-thirds of the price.

480. Do you think it is desirable that the troops should be fed on foreign meat?—No; I would like to see them fed entirely upon home-grown meat. That is a question of expense for the Treasury.

481. One would think that above all people the Government should help the English farmer?—There has been an inquiry into the matter; but the price of our fat sheep at the present time is too high to compete with these sheep killed at the ports.

Friday, 9th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brigg.	Sir John Kinloch.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Doughty.	Mr. MacAleese.
Sir William Houldsworth.	Mr. Mildmay.
Mr. Kilbride.	Mr. A. H. Smith.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. WILLIAM COOPER, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

482. YOU are a member of the London Chamber of Commerce?—That is so.

483. You are chairman of the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of that Chamber?—Yes, and also a member of the council.

484. And you have been engaged for a long time in the dead meat trade?—That is so.

485. Are you also a member of the Cattle Market Committee of the Common Council of the City of London?—That is so.

486. And president of the London Central Meat and Poultry Markets Association?—That is so.

487. You have been yourself a tenant farmer, I believe?—I am now, and have been for nearly 30 years, a tenant farmer.

488. In Aberdeenshire, I believe?—Yes, I have been a tenant farmer under Lord Aberdeen.

489. You speak in your proof of a petition, which I have here, presented by the committee of the London Central Meat and Poultry Markets Association, which, I presume, has been sent to every Member of this Committee?—It has been sent, I believe, to every Member of the House of Commons, and, consequently, to every Member of this Committee.

490. You have made yourself acquainted with the provisions of this Bill?—I have.

491. Did you give evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords on this subject?—I did not.

492. Was evidence given on behalf of the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of the London Chamber of Commerce before the House of Lords Committee?—I think not.

493. Has your section of the London Chamber of Commerce taken any action until just now with regard to this proposal, which has been before the country for some few years?—Yes, we have considered this question from time to time. I have here a copy of the resolution which was passed at a meeting of the section a short time ago. We have, from time to time, considered this question, but I may say that the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of the London Chamber of Commerce was not in existence when the House of Lords Committee took evidence.

Chairman—continued.

494. When was it established?—I think a little over three years ago, immediately after that Committee.

495. May I take it that since it was established they have from time to time discussed this proposal?—Yes.

496. And has there been any difference of opinion in the section?—No, I think not. There has been an unanimous opinion that this Bill certainly would not accomplish the object of its promoters.

497. Perhaps you would read the resolution; what is the date of it?—I do not think it bears a date, but it is, I imagine, about four or five months ago. I may say it immediately followed on the printing of this Bill; as soon as we could obtain a copy of the Bill, the Meat and Cattle Trades Section met and considered the Bill, so that the one date would give the other. The resolution is as follows: "That the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of the London Chamber of Commerce strongly disapprove of the Agricultural Produce (Marks) Bill, introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Wingfield Digby, on the ground that it would, if attempted to be enforced, disorganise and be extremely prejudicial to the meat and cattle trade of the country. That, in the opinion of the section, it would involve enormous expense to the public without any counterbalancing benefit; and, further, that the Bill would not accomplish the object of its promoters, but would tend to benefit the foreign producer at the expense of the British agriculturalist."

498. Did that resolution come before the Chamber of Commerce as a whole?—It came before the council of the Chamber of Commerce.

499. Did they pass a resolution approving of it?—Certainly; they endorsed that resolution.

500. This resolution says that the Bill "would tend to benefit the foreign producer at the expense of the British agriculturalist." I presume you know that the object of the Bill is said to be rather to benefit the home producer?—I believe that is the intention of the promoters.

501. But you are prepared to hold that, on the other hand, it would benefit the foreign producer?—Most decidedly.

Chairman—continued.

502. Will you tell us shortly what is your reason for holding that view?—All advertising of foreign goods has been conclusively proved to benefit the foreigner. The putting on of trade marks and all such things in my opinion benefits the person whose goods are marked; it calls attention to them and advertises them.

503. It is through the advertisement by anything like marks that you think benefit would be given to the foreign producers by this Bill?—Partly in that way, and also by the extraordinary provision of the Bill which declares British all foreign animals, simply because they are landed alive and slaughtered in this country. The wild animals of South America or the ranch-fed cattle of North America, because they chance to be landed here alive are to be for the future declared British, or to be classed along with the lovely black-polled Scotch that we breed in Aberdeenshire.

504. That does not affect the benefit that would accrue to the foreign dead meat trade?—The carcases of all these animals come into the market and are sold dead, and after they are dead they would be, under this Bill, British.

505. We do not call meat foreign dead meat, in the same sense as the meat that is brought over here dead; I am confining myself at the moment to the foreign dead meat so called. You think that the benefit of the Bill to the producer who sends the meat in dead would be by the advertisement it would give?—Partly.

506. Is there any other benefit that the foreign dead meat trade would have except the advertisement?—Nothing strikes me beyond that at the present moment.

507. Now we will come to the other trade, which is the live cattle trade, that is to say the foreign live cattle killed here. Do you think there again the Bill would give a benefit because it calls it British meat?—It would be legalising what is at the present moment considered fraud.

508. Is it fraud; it is not illegal, is it, for a man to sell meat that is killed at the port of entry?—No.

509. Then how do you say it is fraud?—In London you not infrequently see a sign above a butcher's shop, "British Farmers' Association," or "Sussex Farmers' Association," or "Bedfordshire Farmers' Association," and if you look in the shop you will probably see that the great bulk of the beef, I might say that the whole of the beef, is Deptford, killed American, or Liverpool, killed American; that is in my opinion, if not fraud, very near it; it is misrepresentation. You will also see put up, "All meat home-killed," leading, I suppose, the public or the purchaser to believe that it is home produce, whereas it is foreign.

510. I will now deal with what I see in the petition of the London Central Meat and Poultry Markets Association, and leave the question of the Chamber of Commerce on one side for the moment. In paragraph 2 of the Petition it says that this Association "is composed of tenants in the London Central Meat Market engaged in carrying on the wholesale meat trade of the Metropolis"?—That is so.

511. Has this Association also carefully considered as an Association the effect of this Bill if it were passed into law?—That is so.

512. Are they unanimous in the opinion they have formed of it, whatever that opinion is?—Decidedly.

513. I see it is said that in the belief of the Petitioners the provisions of the Bill would be impracticable, and secondly, that it is "open to grave objection, being likely to lead to great injustice, and to hamper and harass persons carrying on a legitimate and necessary trade;" I should rather like you to take the second objection first?—A small trader, of course, if this Bill passed, would not be able to divide his premises into two departments. To successfully carry on both businesses it would be necessary to have separate departments, and therefore I fear the result of the Bill would be to destroy the trade of the small traders, because their premises would not permit of separate departments, and so draw the trade into the hands of large stores.

514. There is nothing in the Bill, is there, that compels a division of premises?—No, there is nothing in the Bill.

515. Then that point would not arise on the Bill, but as you have mentioned it, I should rather like to ask you whether you think there would really be any very great difficulty in a man who wanted to sell both home produced meat and foreign meat, dividing his premises sufficiently to indicate two departments though they might be small ones, in which he would openly and professedly sell in the one foreign meat, and in the other home-produced meat?—I do not think it would be at all practicable in a small shop.

516. You are speaking now, I suppose, of the retail trade?—Yes.

517. Of retail butchers?—Of retail butchers only.

518. I suppose in the larger butchers' premise there would be no difficulty?—Do you refer to the wholesale butchers?

519. No, I mean the larger retailers?—With the larger retail stores, and so on, there could be no difficulty.

520. What I mean by a large retail trader is one of the large butchers' shops that one finds in large towns?—Yes, there would be no difficulty at all in large traders' shops.

521. You are referring to small premises both in towns and in villages?—Yes. Of course, I have principally London in my mind, being better acquainted with that than I am with any other place.

522. You think there are such small premises which sell meat retail, that it would be impossible (supposing an Act of Parliament was passed compelling them to do so) to separate distinctly and ostensibly the sale of foreign meat from the sale of home-produced meat?—I do not think it would be possible to satisfy the public.

523. But I am asking you rather (because I am interested in this), whether there would be really any serious difficulty in the small trade complying with that obligation?—I think so.

524. Is it not common, even in the smallest shops, for different parts of the shop to be allocated to different stores; take a grocer's shop,

Chairman—continued.

for instance, it is very often the case, is it not, that there is one part of the shop devoted to one sort of article that is sold and another part to another?—I am not aware of it; I do not know much about grocers, and I cannot say quite whether that is so or not.

525. But take poultry and fish; it is not uncommon, I think, to see fish on one side of the shop, and poultry on the other?—That is a combination that does exist, but it is not common in London.

526. However, I take it from you that you think there would be a certain class of small traders in whose case it would be difficult to divide their shop in any way sufficiently to make a distinction between the foreign meat and the home grown?—That is decidedly my opinion.

527. Of course, you will understand I am suggesting to you, not necessarily a partition or anything very complicated, but simply a sufficient part of the shop over which it would be marked distinctly that it was foreign meat, and another part that it was home grown?—I understand.

528. You think that that would be impracticable?—I do.

529. Now we will come to the Bill, because, as I have said, that point does not arise under the Bill. What the Bill proposes is that foreign meat shall be marked, and of course you will understand that it is to be marked in accordance with rules drawn up by the Board of Agriculture. We do not know what those rules may be, but I should like, for the sake of eliciting your opinion, to suppose that the rules of the Board of Agriculture would be simply that the carcases were to be marked at the time of importation. Do you see any objection to that?—None whatever. All the dead foreign meat that comes to this country, I believe, is marked now.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

530. On the quarters?—Yes, it is marked.

Chairman.

531. Let me follow that up; it what way is it marked?—I believe that American beef is marked by means of a wire and a leaden impress on every quarter of beef.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

532. That is in one place?—In one place.

Chairman.

533. Is that done by the exporter?—That is done by the Government of America.

534. Before it is exported?—Before it is exported.

535. Do you know if that is done by law?—It is done by law. It is done by the Government in order to guarantee that the meat is clear of disease; it is a guarantee of its being clear of disease.

536. You know that that is done for a fact?—The whole of the evidence as to that was given before the Committee of the House of Lords in the Blue Book.

537. I am afraid we are going over a great deal of what may be in the Blue Book, but some of us may not read the Blue Book. We would like just to have the fact from you. If you could refer us to the passage in the Blue Book it may save your time and the time of the Committee. That is the fact, you say?—Yes, that is the fact.

538. You say that it appears in the evidence given before the House of Lords Committee?—Yes.

539. Can you refer us to the passage?—I think it is Mr. Thomson's evidence at page 151, and onwards. I am not certain whether it is in his evidence, but I know it is in this Blue Book. I cannot point to the exact place, but I know it is the fact.

540. Then you do not see any difficulty in the carcases being marked?—There is none.

341. Are you aware of the system in Belgium?—I was present yesterday and heard Mr. Jeffreys give his evidence. I am sorry my experience does not quite endorse what he then said.

542. Do you mean, you do not know whether what he said is the fact?—What he said may be the fact, I am not questioning his facts; but his evidence left the impression upon my mind, at all events, that carcases could be imported into Belgium. I know that experienced butchers in London have, on more than one occasion, endeavoured to send to Belgium joints of meat, and in all cases they have been condemned and refused admission, the answer given being that nothing could be admitted to Belgium unless the lungs were attached to it; therefore no carcases, as we ordinarily use the term, could be imported into Belgium if that is the law.

543. I would like you now to tell us very shortly what you think the injustice of a system of marking to the trader?—Do you refer to the marking of it as it is landed here for the wholesale trade?

544. Yes?—There can be no injustice in that. It is done now, but if you ask whether it is of any use, I should say certainly not. The wholesale trader is not deceived in any way. There is no such thing as deception in the wholesale trade; there is no idea of such a thing. Every man who comes in to buy in the wholesale trade is an expert himself, and, if he is deceived, he is deceived as an ordinary mortal who makes a mistake is deceived. There is no misrepresentation, therefore there is no necessity to mark meat for the wholesale trade. Before I leave that point there is something Mr. Jeffreys mentioned yesterday with regard to the marking of carcases of mutton which perhaps I might refer to. I have worked out a little problem last evening which I think may be interesting to the Committee. You had evidence that a cargo of 90,000 carcases of mutton arrived in one ship; to mark those in the manner suggested by Mr. Jeffreys I have computed would take 250 men 12 hours.

545. Do you know exactly what speed they would go at?—Yes; I reckon two a minute, which is as much as they could possibly do.

546. That is an estimate of your own; you take as the basis of your calculation an estimate of your own?—Yes; I think for stripping the carcases of the cloth, and to mark them as Mr. Jeffreys suggested, two per minute would be a very

Chairman—continued.

very fair figure to take; it would be very quick if they did that, and, according to that estimate, 90,000 carcases would take 250 men 12 hours to mark.

547. You heard the statement which Mr. Jeffreys made, that the carcases in Brussels are stamped as quickly as letters are stamped?—Yes.

548. You take two per minute as your estimate for stamping, and then would there be some time for stripping the cloth off?—That is included.

549. The conditions here would be rather different from what Mr. Jeffreys described at Brussels, because there all the carcases are hanging up without covering upon them, and the stamping only has to take place?—That is not the case with regard to this cargo of sheep arriving in London which I am talking about.

550. I know that, and that is why I put it to you that the stripping of the carcases and the stamping of them would involve in our case here a longer time necessarily than what Mr. Jeffreys described took place in the abattoirs at Brussels?—Decidedly.

551. Therefore we should have to add in this case the time occupied in stripping the carcase, which I suppose is probably most of the half-minute that you take in your estimate?—I think my estimate assumes a very quick dispatch, to strip two sheep and mark them in a minute.

552. It has been suggested that the meat might be marked with the sheets on, that the mark would go through the sheet?—That I should very greatly doubt. You must never forget that these carcases are as hard as adamant, and the cloth of course is full of frozen water; that is to say it is frozen for some time. I have no data to go upon but my own impression is that if the mark went through at all it would be simply a blurred mark, and it would be perfectly unintelligible as to what it was and therefore would be practically no mark at all.

553. Now you have given us evidence with regard to the wholesale trader; and you say the re-marking is perfectly unnecessary because the wholesale trader knows perfectly well what he is dealing in?—Perfectly.

554. And I presume the man who buys from the wholesale trader also knows what he is getting?—Certainly.

555. Therefore, we come now to the retail trader and the public. I should like to ask you this question. Is it the fact that an expert is able in all cases or, if you like to qualify that I will say in nearly all cases, to tell by looking at the meat whether it is chilled or frozen meat, or whether it is fresh meat?—I think, generally speaking, an expert would be able to tell frozen meat from fresh meat.

556. May I take it that frozen meat is synonymous with foreign dead meat?—Yes, all that arrives dead in this country is frozen meat except the chilled American, that is not frozen.

557. Can you distinguish between the chilled American meat and the home-grown meat?—Yes, I think so. It presents different characteristics

Chairman—continued.

to the home-killed meat most decidedly. Of course I do not mean to say that you could not find a case of deception where an expert would be deceived, because I mentioned particularly in the proof of my evidence which I have handed in a case on the point, where experts were deceived, but it would be so rare that it is scarcely worth mentioning.

558. Can you at all indicate what the kind of difference is; is it in the appearance of the meat?—Yes, but that sort of thing is far easier known than it is expressed. To the expert eye it will be seen at once.

559. It is by the eye; it is not by any test?—There is no test for meat at all. If a man's eye does not tell him, there is no other means of discerning it. No chemical process or investigation is of any use with regard to meat if your eye does not tell you.

560. Is that faculty of distinguishing between one kind of meat and the other easily learnt by a man?—I think so.

561. In a very short time?—I think so.

562. If he is shown what the difference is, you think he easily learns to distinguish them?—Undoubtedly he would easily learn to distinguish between what you have described as chilled meat and fresh killed meat, but I am talking about imported fresh killed meat that has never been in a refrigerator.

563. You are referring now to foreign cattle killed on this side?—I do not mind whether it is cattle or what it is.

564. Is not all dead meat that is imported here frozen or chilled or kept in a cold place?—That does not follow; for instance, the whole of the animals slaughtered at Deptford——

565. I am not speaking of foreign cattle slaughtered here. I am speaking exclusively of what is exported and imported here as dead meat?—That is kept in a refrigerator coming here.

566. That is all frozen or chilled?—Yes, what is called refrigerated.

567. Please exclude for the moment all question of foreign animals slaughtered here. It is dead meat exported from a foreign country that I am dealing with just now. With regard to the whole of that, you say that an expert could tell the difference between that and fresh killed meat, with the qualification you give, that he might be occasionally deceived?—Yes.

568. And you say the faculty of distinguishing them is easily learned?—Certainly.

569. I suppose the general public in a retail shop would not very easily know the difference?—It depends entirely upon who the general public is. The poorer people know it at once; they are good judges of their business; they have very little money to spend, and they spend it very carefully. The people who do not know are the people who do not take any trouble; the butcher supplies their cook, and they do not trouble themselves.

570. You think in regard to the mass of the people, the wives who go and buy the meat know pretty well what they are buying?—Decidedly.

571. I suppose they buy a large quantity of

Chairman—continued.

this foreign dead meat, knowing that it is foreign?—Undoubtedly.

572. Then is it your opinion that a retail trader could not very easily deceive them?—It depends upon who his customers are; he would not deceive the poor people who come themselves to the shop to buy it.

573. I am speaking of the mass of the people coming to shop; would he deceive them; I know he would easily deceive me?—I am not sure of that.

574. I have been asked to ask you a question which bears upon this point, and I think it would be useful: Is all continental meat refrigerated or frozen?—Oh, no; continental meat, as I understand, would mean meat from the continent of Europe; that is not frozen at all nor refrigerated.

575. Would any difference be observable there?—I think there would be very great difficulty many a time in discerning the difference. I have seen myself lambs from Holland which it would take a very clever expert to tell from Scotch. The carcases of mutton also many times greatly resemble Scotch.

576. I suppose the difference, if it was discovered at all by an expert, would be rather by the quality of the meat itself than upon any process that it had gone through, through the delay in bringing it over?—The quality is very good indeed. We get beautiful mutton and lamb from Holland.

577. You say that the continental dead meat imported here could not be distinguished?—In many cases it could not.

578. I do not know why the petition of the association refers to the separate department for foreign meat that would be required if this Bill be passed, because as I have pointed out there is nothing in the Bill to indicate that that would be required?—But you see according to the schedule of the Bill the marking of the meat is left to the discretion of the Board of Agriculture, and it would greatly depend upon who the Minister was, and what majority he had got at his back, what the marks of the meat were to be.

579. But that does not quite cover my question, because the petition speaks of separate departments being kept in a retail trader's shop. I want to know (because something may hang upon it; I do not know whether it does or not) why you specially refer to that when it does not appear in the Bill, and when there would be no power for the Board of Agriculture, as I read the Bill, to impose that requirement. What the rules of the Board of Agriculture are to be about is the marking of meat itself, not keeping a separate department in the shop?—No, but I think in regard to Section 3 of the Bill on each retail sale of meat it would be a very fair question to ask, does this particular piece of meat comply with the section by being marked in accordance with the Act.

580. Then that leads me to ask this question, which I thought perhaps was at the basis of it; is it the case that you think practically a trader, although not compelled to keep separate departments, would practically have to do so if the

Chairman—continued

Bill in its present shape was carried out?—Undoubtedly.

581. In order to protect himself?—Not only to protect himself but to give confidence to his customers.

582. I gather from you that you do not think the marking itself would give confidence to his customers?—That would depend entirely upon what the marking was. If you are to follow it up and mark every joint it would be so oppressive that I think it would be practically impossible.

583. And you think that unless every joint was marked there would be no more protection to the public than there is at present?—None.

584. You think the fact of the carcase of the sheep having been marked at the port of importation would not be a protection. I suppose the whole sheep would go to a retail trader?—He might purchase whole sheep or only a portion. Of course the trader purchases what he requires for his particular trade.

585. Is it the case that a great number of retail traders do not purchase whole sheep?—Yes; I should say that the great proportion of the meat in the wholesale market is sold in pieces. We are simply distributors; we cut it up as our customers require.

586. The retail trader buys it in pieces to a very great extent?—To a very great extent.

587. I suppose that more than one-half of the sales would be in carcases?—No. In my particular business (I am in the Aberdeen trade entirely) not one-fiftieth portion is sold whole. I was going to say a very much larger figure than that, but that is well within the mark.

588. You are speaking now of your own business?—Of my own particular business in the Central Market. I deal entirely in Aberdeen and Scotch meat and nothing else at all. Of that article I do not sell one-fiftieth of it whole.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

589. Are you speaking of beef or mutton?—Both.

Chairman.

590. You do not deal in foreign meat yourself, but, I presume, you would know the practice of other traders who deal in foreign meat?—Yes.

591. Would that same remark apply to foreign meat?—Undoubtedly.

592. The great bulk of it, and in fact as I understand the very large proportion of it, is sold in joints?—Not exactly joints; it is sold in pieces. A butcher in the West-end would take the hind quarters and fore ribs, that is the prime parts; and a butcher in another part of London would take the other portions; and some people would come up from the country and buy another portion. We simply distribute it to the various people, according as they have a demand for the article.

593. If the mark did not happen to be on the piece a man bought, the mark is perfectly useless in that case?—Of course.

594. I think I had better ask you, as this paper before me is rather a lengthy document, and I do not know that I have read it very carefully, if you

Chairman—continued.

you would just mention any other point you would like to bring before the Committee which is not covered by the questions you have been already asked. You would understand that probably the subjects I have gone over will be dealt with by some of the members of the Committee in cross-examination. I want you rather to indicate any point you wish to bring before the Committee?—I think the most important point, in our view, is that it is impossible to determine what meat it is when it is cut in pieces; that is to say, if three sirloins of beef, fresh killed, one American, one Scotch, and one English, were placed together it would be utterly impossible in many cases, even for an expert, to tell which was which.

595. I thought you had already said that they could distinguish between them?—I am talking now of animals killed in this country in each case, not meat imported dead.

596. I understand; then I think now we may go to that part which I wished to exclude in the first instance, because I was then inquiring about dead meat; what you mean to say now is that if the animal is killed in this country it is impossible then even for experts to tell whether it is foreign cattle or whether it is home grown?—Certainly, when it is in pieces.

597. Could an expert tell when it is in the carcase?—He might; he would be far more likely to tell in the carcase, but when it is once in pieces it would be impossible for anyone, even for experts, to give an opinion definitely.

598. You say you think they could tell in the carcase; can you give me any idea how they would tell; would it be a difference in the quality of the meat?—Some meat that comes from abroad is of splendid quality and of splendid formation.

599. In that case they would not be able to tell by the quality?—It is more difficult to describe what one knows about that than it is to tell when you see it. The expert has an educated eye, and he would be able to tell.

600. Take two animals, one coming from abroad and the other grown in this country, equally good in quality as you say in some cases they are, could an educated eye tell which was the one of foreign origin?—He might be deceived, but he would be more likely to be right then than he would if he saw it at any other time; if he was wrong, then I am sure he could not do it if it was in pieces.

601. Are you in favour or against the provisions in the Bill which would make meat killed here, though of foreign origin, British?—I think that is a most extraordinary proposition. I object most strongly to the beautiful animals we breed in Aberdeenshire being classed along with the wild cattle in America, and to having such animals stamped as British; it is a most monstrous proposition.

602. You mean they would not be actually stamped British, but they would come in without being stamped foreign; it is the same thing?—Yes. That is a most extraordinary proposition; I cannot understand an agriculturist advocating such a thing.

603. You saw the former Bill, I think?—There have been so many of them that I do not know which you refer to.

604. You have seen the other Bills; in that case the provision you refer to now was not in?—No; I think this Bill is more dreadful than any of its predecessors.

605. Are there any other points you wish to refer to?—Yes; there is this question of the inspectors, which I think is a very important thing. Of course, to be capable of judging the meat, these men must be highly trained; they must be men of excellent character and intelligence. I think it would involve an enormous expense to obtain such men as would be required under this Bill; they are most difficult to get now. Being myself a member of the Markets Committee of the Corporation of London, I have some experience of the difficulty in getting proper men for the purpose of inspection under our powers of inspection in the Central Market. I am sure there would be equal difficulty, or, rather, more difficulty, from the large quantity they would require, to obtain proper men if this Bill were passed. The ordinary inspector at the present moment is simply a man who is able to say whether the meat is fit for human food or whether it is not; that is all ——

606. You told me a little while ago that you could easily teach anybody to know the difference between foreign meat and English meat?—No; between refrigerated meat and home-killed; that is what I said.

607. I was dealing with the dead meat; do I understand your doubt as whether inspectors could be got does not refer necessarily to dead meat?—It does not necessarily refer to meat coming to this country dead.

608. You are now saying that the difficulty in the inspection would be to discriminate between foreign cattle killed here and home-grown meat?—Decidedly. I think an expert might be deceived, and would be deceived, in many instances, and I am certain it would be impossible to get the proper class of men without enormous expense.

609. That question does not arise under the Bill as it stands, does it?—I think so.

610. They would not have to discriminate the home grown meat from foreign cattle killed here because that is all to be classed as British under the Bill. You are quite right to mention that point; I am only seeing the bearing of it, and it would be as I say. If the Bill was carried in its entirety, the inspectors would not have to discriminate between foreign cattle killed here and home-grown cattle; they would only have to discriminate between dead meat imported here, and all other kinds of meat, and you say they would easily be educated to distinguish that?—According to one particular clause of the Bill an inspectors is to be at liberty to take portions of meat without payment from the butcher's shop; it does not say how much he can take away. It also says that a prosecution need not arise under three months. Considering the perishable nature of meat that is far too long a time.

611. I take it generally that you think under the Bill, as to the system of inspection and inspectors, there would be considerable difficulty in carrying

Chairman—continued

carrying out that system. I suppose you would also consider it would harass the trade, and that you object to?—Yes, I think it is impossible; I think it could not be done. I think in all probability it would lead to very great conflict and a great deal of trouble.

612. Is there any other point you wish to refer to?—In the Bill the nature of meat seems to have been lost sight of; meat changes so quickly in character from hour to hour and is so liable to atmospheric change that if the inspector took a piece of meat away if this time were allowed to lapse there would be no defence on the part of the butcher to any action that was brought, because he could not possibly have any defence. The meat would be decomposed or it would have changed in character and the evidence would be completely gone. The magistrate would have the evidence of the inspector to go by, and there would be no evidence on the part of the butcher.

613. You mean there would be no tangible evidence that could be brought into court?—Quite so.

614. It would simply be the word of the inspector against the word of the butcher?—Yes. Three months seems to me to be a long limit in the case of such an article as meat.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

615. Would not the butcher be able to swear where he got the meat from. He would be able to give evidence of origin, would he not?—I cannot say.

Chairman.

616. There is one question I have been asked to ask you. Could an expert distinguish between foreign meat cut into joints and home meat treated in the same way, if the home meat had been refrigerated?—That might not be so. I think he would have very great difficulty indeed in many cases in doing so.

617. As a rule, is the home meat refrigerated?—Many butchers find it absolutely necessary to do so.

618. Do the wholesale people do it?—No; at Deptford Market, of course, there is a very large system of refrigeration, without which it would be impossible to carry on the trade.

619. You mean to cold storage?—Yes.

620. If home meat, which had been in that cold store, was afterwards compared with the other, would it be difficult to distinguish between that and the foreign refrigerated meat?—Of course, the longer it remained in the refrigerator the more closely would it resemble refrigerated meat from America.

621. Is there any other point you would like to bring before the Committee?—I should like to mention, in connection with what was said by a witness yesterday, to the effect that all agriculturists were in favour of this Bill, that I have a letter here which I will read if you think fit. It is from a gentleman well known as being one of the greatest breeders of cattle in this country, Mr. Duthie, the shorthorn breeder in Aberdeenshire. I sent him a copy of this Bill, and this is his reply. He says: "There is only one opinion here regarding the Bill, that it

Chairman—continued.

contains at least one fatal clause." He does not say which is the clause, but I can draw my own inference.

622. You will observe that registration is suggested in the Bill. Have you anything to say with regard to that; do you think it would be a hardship, or would there be any objection to requiring any dealer selling foreign meat to be registered?—Take my own case; we do not sell any foreign meat, but we sometimes have consignments sent to us——

623. Had we not better confine it to retail traders?—I will mention both if you will allow me to do so. Speaking of myself first, I think the hardship would be this: I, of course, would not require a license, because I do not sell any foreign meat; but it is open at any time for any consignor of meat to consign meat to me without my knowledge or consent, and he might send legs of pork, which pork had come from Holland. He might send legs of mutton in the same way of which the carcases had come from Holland and re-consign them to me for sale one morning, and I should find myself without my knowledge or consent in the position of an offender against this Act, and liable to the penalties.

624. Sometimes does it take place then that you do sell that meat for him?—It does not happen actually with me, but it might happen to anyone in the Central Market in the same position as I am.

625. Supposing somebody did consign meat in that way to you personally, would you act?—Yes, undoubtedly.

626. You would act on his behalf as agent to sell?—Yes.

627. Are there wholesale traders in the market to which that constantly occurs?—Yes, decidedly.

628. That is your objection with regard to registration as regards the wholesale trade. Now we will take the case of the retail traders; would there be any hardship in their case?—I think it is a great hardship that a man conducting an honest business in a proper manner should be obliged by any Act of Parliament without any sufficient or good shown reason to put any notice over his shop. I think it is a hardship, because there is a certain amount of stigma attached to it undoubtedly.

629. You think it would be a stigma?—Undoubtedly.

630. There are some retail traders, are there not, who do now put up, ostensibly for the purposes of their business, a notice to say that they do deal in nothing else but foreign meat?—There may be; I am not aware.

631. I think I have seen it; I understand, at any rate, there are some who think it is for the good of their business, because, of course, the price is cheaper?—That is so.

632. And they are going in to cut out the higher priced meat?—That would be so, I presume.

633. Do you consider that there is a good deal of the foreign dead meat that is good?—There is no doubt that much of the meat that arrives in this country dead from abroad is very

good

Chairman—continued.

good indeed, and that which comes alive is very good also.

634. You say that some, at all events, of the dead meat is very good?—A great deal.

635. You say it is quite as good as the other, though it could be distinguished?—No, I do not say it is as good as the other. The best meat in the world is Scotch beef and mutton, without any exception.

636. May I put it in this way. Is a good deal of foreign dead meat that comes in as good as a good deal of the meat that is grown in this country?—Undoubtedly, and better. I say that the best refrigerated beef is decidedly of better value than the secondary sorts of English undoubtedly.

637. I notice that in your *précis* of evidence you object very strongly "to the provisions as to having in possession foreign meat for the purpose of sale as British." Would you tell us what your objection is. In that connection I observe you refer to paragraph 5 of the petition of the association?—That is so.

638. Will you describe the objection you entertain to those words?—I do not think I could describe it in better language than it is expressed in here in the petition: "that these clauses would expose every person dealing in foreign meat to the peril of prosecution for an offence against the Act upon the charge that he had kept such foreign meat or had it in his possession for the purpose of sale 'as or for British or Irish meat' though he was duly registered under Clause 6 and though he had neither dealt in such foreign meat nor sold or offered or exposed it for sale." It would be open to any inspector to say that. The butcher might be liable to the charge though he had never attempted to sell it merely because he had got it in his possession.

639. But he would not have it in his possession unless he was going to sell it, would he?—But it says in the Bill "for the purpose of sale as or for British." He might be selling it for what it was. It is ambiguous, the language is not plain.

640. In what clause of the Bill are those words to which you object; is it Clause 4?—Yes, Clauses 4 and 5, I think.

641. Clause 4 is: "Every person who shall deal in, sell, offer, expose, or keep for sale, or have in his possession for the purpose of sale, any foreign meat or cheese as or for British or Irish meat or cheese, shall be guilty of an offence under this Act"?—Yes.

642. An inspector might find in a man's possession foreign meat, and he might be able to prove it was foreign, but your point is, how would he prove he was selling it for British or Irish meat?—That is so.

643. At all events, if he charged him with that, he would have to defend himself against it. I suppose the only way that would be carried out would be, that the inspector would have to stand by and see the sale and hear what passed?—I do not know whether that could be managed at all.

644. That would be an unlikely case, I presume. Is there any other point you wish to refer to?—I do not know that I observe anything just at present.

645. I daresay something else may come out in cross-examination, but if it does not and anything occurs to you after the cross-examination, I will give you another opportunity of mentioning any points you wish to refer to, because some may occur to you?—Thank you; I have here a report from the Central Markets Committee which I should like to hand in, as it may be of some assistance. A good deal was said yesterday about weights and quantity, and I understood you wished to have an accurate knowledge as to that. This is a return supplied by the Corporation of London of the whole weighed quantities that passed through the Central Market during the year 1896. If it would be of any service to you I will hand it in (*handing in the same*).

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

646. To take one of your last points first, you said that Clause 4 was ambiguous; is it not within your knowledge that one clause of an Act or Bill is to be read with another clause. Your point was that Clause 4 was ambiguous, because you said it would be necessary for the inspector if he found meat on the premises of a butcher or somebody who was exposing it for sale to stand by and wait until he should see that he sold it as English; but if you read Clause 5 I think you will find that a dealer must not sell this foreign meat under the Bill unless he is registered as a dealer in foreign meat. Taking those two clauses together, do you still think Clause 4 is ambiguous and that it would be necessary for the inspector to stand by till a sale took place?—The offence would be selling foreign meat for British or Irish meat.

647. Or exposing it for sale?—Yes; the Bill says, "having in his possession for the purpose of sale;" that is what I object to.

648. Does a butcher generally put up a lot of meat in his shop unless he intends to sell it?—No; but if he has two sorts of meat in his shop he need not sell the one for the other.

649. If you read the next clause you will see that he is not entitled to put up in his shop foreign meat unless he is registered as a dealer in it?—That would not exempt him from the penalties of the former clause.

650. Do you still hold that if he had not registered himself as a dealer in foreign meat it would be necessary for the inspector to stand by while the sale is carried out?—No, that would not be necessary. The only thing that it would be necessary for the inspector to do would be to accuse him of doing it.

651. But I took it your answer was that a butcher does not generally hang up meat in the shop except for sale?—That is what the butchers have meat for, I imagine.

652. Did I understand you to say that you did not yourself deal in foreign meat?—That is so.

653. But you also anticipate a danger that someone might send foreign meat to a man who did not deal in foreign meat, and that meat would

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

would be sold as English meat?—No, I did not say that, I think.

654. I understood you to say that there was a danger of foreign meat being consigned (legs of mutton, I think you said) to a dealer who did not sell foreign meat, and being sold as English meat?—No, I did not say that.

Chairman.

655. You pointed out that if a man was not registered he might commit an offence if a consignor sent him foreign meat without his knowing it. It was upon the point of registration, I think?—Yes.

656. That is to say, it would involve this, that everyone would have to register; is not that so?—That is the only protection he might have under circumstances in which he might be placed, though he might be perfectly innocent.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

657. However, I understand you to say you do not think that there would be any great danger of that. Then you spoke about the home-meat that passes through Deptford, and is put into a refrigerator?—I do not think I spoke of home-meat passing through Deptford. Deptford is the market for foreign meat, not home-meat.

658. I distinctly understood you to say that there would be a danger with regard to home-meat that went through Deptford market and that was put into the refrigerator, of being unable to distinguish between that and foreign meat?—When you say home-meat you mean the meat that is killed at Deptford.

659. No, I mean British meat?—British meat does not find its way to Deptford; it is not there at all.

660. Then was your point only the difficulty of distinguishing between foreign meat killed in England, at Deptford, when it is put into the refrigerator, from meat that comes over frozen?—You misunderstood me. I referred to the retail butcher, and, of course, he has nothing to do with Deptford.

661. You mentioned Deptford in your principal evidence?—Yes, but I do not think I mentioned it in connection with the point you put. The retail butcher might purchase some town-killed meat, and he might have it in his refrigerator at home some considerable period. Of course all refrigerated meat after remaining in the refrigerator for some time must show signs of refrigeration, and, therefore, there might come a time when it would be practically impossible to tell that meat from refrigerated American.

662. Then I take it the difference you were referring to was only between live American which comes into this country and is killed, and passed through the refrigerator at Deptford, and the dead meat coming in frozen?—I do not quite follow you.

663. Do you say that a large quantity of home-meat, grown by the farmers in this country, goes to Deptford, and is put into the refrigerator there?—I have not spoken of Deptford in connection with home-meat at all. There is no home-meat can go to Deptford. Deptford is entirely for animals arriving from abroad and slaughtered at Deptford.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

664. Your difference is between foreign animals that come in alive and those that come in dead?—I do not follow you.

665. You made the point that it would be hard to distinguish between animals which are put into the refrigerator at Deptford, after they are killed in this country, and the dead meat which comes in frozen into this country; was not that your point?—Yes, after they have been refrigerated; I did not say frozen. There is a great deal of difference between the two things. In the case of town-killed refrigerated meat there must come a time in the refrigeration when it will resemble the imported meat killed at Deptford and refrigerated there.

666. I think I understood you to say that the marking of meat was harassing and quite impossible to be carried out; did you not say that?—I say it is harassing; I do not say it is impossible to be carried out.

667. You probably heard the evidence given here yesterday?—I did.

668. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Jeffreys with regard to the system of marking in Belgium and in many other countries on the Continent. Have you heard at all whether it is harassing there?—I am not aware; I have no experience of the trade in those countries. Of course, the trade there is very, very small; it is nothing like London.

669. It may not be concentrated in such a small space, but in a country like Russia, where the meat has all to be marked, I suppose the Russians, with their great population, eat almost as much as we do?—I think they only get a much smaller proportion per head.

670. But taking the whole country together, all the people inhabiting that vast area, and the much smaller population inhabiting this country, I suppose they eat as much as we?—I have no idea.

671. When the meat is cut into joints, did you say that it was impossible for any one to tell which was foreign and which English, or did you say it was impossible for anyone not an expert?—I say it is perfectly impossible for an expert to tell which was foreign and which was English.

672. Do you say it is impossible for an expert to tell which had come over as dead frozen meat?—No, I say if you take three sides of beef or three carcases, one Scotch, killed in this country, and one English, killed in this country, and one American, killed in this country, and place the portions alongside each other, there is not one butcher in London could tell which is which.

673. But you know this Bill does not at present refer to live animals brought into this country and killed here?—No, I think that is the extraordinary portion of it.

674. I do not take it that it is impossible for an expert to tell the difference between foreign dead meat imported into this country, and fresh English or Scotch or American meat?—No, certainly not.

675. You mean it is not impossible?—No, certainly not.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

676. I understood your main objection to the registration clauses of this Bill was the stigma that would be put upon the butcher?—That is one of the objections.

677. I do not understand the nature of the stigma; surely the stigma, if there is any, would be caused by the prejudice there is against foreign meat, which would lead us to suppose that ordinary purchasers would not buy it to the extent they do if they knew it was foreign?—I never heard of prejudice against American beef, unless among a few agriculturists.

678. Then what is the stigma?—It is in this way: if a man put a notice board over his shop, I think the British public would naturally think that the man had been selling foreign meat for a very long period to them probably as English, and probably they would look upon him with grave suspicion. That is only a natural inference to draw from the fact, and I think it would be a very serious loss to the retail butchers.

679. If you were a dealer in foreign meat yourself would you object to its being known that you were dealing in foreign meat?—There is no need to be ashamed of it; it is a perfectly legitimate trade.

680. Quite so; but then I do not see where the stigma comes in?—I have shown how to my mind it presents itself.

681. Would you say that foreign refrigerated meat is very often as good as certain English qualities?—It is a great deal better sometimes.

682. That would be the inferior qualities of English meat?—No; I should not even go so far as that. I should say that the best refrigerated American beef is better than the ordinary second-class English. I think that is clearly brought out in the evidence before the House of Lords Committee.

683. Then why do you not yourself deal in this foreign refrigerated beef?—I am sorry to say there is a very great limit to what we can do. If I had half of the market, or a whole side of the market, I might engage in other business. But Scotch beef and mutton is all I can manage; I have as much as I can possibly attend to, and therefore I cannot go into any other department; it is not because there is any objection to it at all.

684. The stigma you allude to is that you think directly this notice was put over a man's shop to the effect that he sold foreign meat the public would jump at the conclusion that he had been deceiving them for many years?—I have no doubt many would think so, and a butcher who put it up would be likely to lose many of his best customers; the public are apt to be suspicious.

685. Then do you think there is good reason for this suspicion in many cases; I do not say in the case of honest dealers?—I have told you that there are cases in which misrepresentations take place, but from what I see myself I think there is very much less misrepresentation now than there was when this foreign trade was younger. I think the public have got more educated.

686. You admit that there is a considerable amount of misrepresentation against which this

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

Bill is aimed, but you object to the Bill; would you recommend Parliament to allow the fraud to go on?—I am very sorry, but I am not a Member of Parliament.

687. But you are here to give an opinion as to what Parliament should do; is it your opinion that the House of Commons should not endeavour to remedy this state of affairs?—I think the House of Commons by this Bill will be creating ten times more difficulty than they will remove.

688. In view of this misrepresentation at the present time, are you opposed to the House of Commons dealing with the matter, and introducing a scheme of meat-marking, in any shape or form?—I am not in favour of the marking of anything, and I say the very worst misrepresentation under this Bill you propose to legalise.

689. So far as I understand, you maintain that it is no use for the House of Commons to endeavour to deal with this fraud (which you admit exists, to a certain extent, at the present time) by way of insisting upon the identification of meat?—I have not seen yet any feasible plan of dealing with it.

690. And you do not think a feasible plan could be produced?—I do not.

691. If a feasible plan could be produced I do not suppose you would be opposed to it; you have no strong objection to marking, as I understand, but you are opposed to the onus of marking falling upon those you represent?—No. I do not say that the onus would fall upon those I represent. I represent the wholesale trade, and there is no onus upon them.

692. I mean the onus that falls upon the retail butchers?—The marking cannot be followed out throughout. I could understand the point of a Bill provided it could be followed out; but there is no deception in the wholesale trade; therefore it is unnecessary to mark the consignments as they arrive from abroad. It is perfectly impossible to mark the meat in pieces; therefore why pursue it.

693. Is there any difficulty in insisting upon the marking by the shippers. We have made certain conditions under the Merchandise Marks Act with regard to imports. The shippers before the House of Lords Committee expressed their willingness to have meat marked; is there any difficulty in insisting upon that?—It is all marked now. I do not know a single consignment arriving from foreign countries (I do not mean the Continent) that is not marked.

694. You said that all American beef was sent here as marked?—Yes.

695. Is that under a new law?—No, it is not a new law; it was in force at all events at the time of this Report of the Committee of the House of Lords.

696. Does not this American system consist not of an imprint upon the meat itself at all, but of a tag, and therefore it affords no protection at all to the retail buyer over here?—It is merely for identifying the carcase that it has passed inspection in America.

697. It is a tag, is it not?—It is a piece of wire with a piece of lead impressed.

698. That would not act as a protection for the retail buyer over here?—Certainly not.

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

That is just my contention. You cannot devise a scheme whereby the British producer would be protected if there is fraud.

699. Do not you think, then, it is possible to mark meat?—I have not heard any feasible or practicable proposition for doing it yet.

700. You are aware that they do it abroad?—I hear what they do abroad, but that is only for protection against bad meat being sold. I do not like to combat anything Mr. Jeffreys said, because I am sure anything he would say would be to the best of his knowledge and belief, but my own impression with regard to the principle of stamping meat in Holland, is that it is to show that the animal was clear of disease when it was slaughtered; that is the primary thing; it is not followed beyond that, so far as I know.

701. Whatever the mark does, it is effectual for that purpose, and if you have a mark showing that the meat is good meat for eating, you can surely have a mark showing where it comes from. Do you really contend that there can be no method of marking meat which will show to the retail buyer where that meat comes from?—I do not know of one.

Chairman.

702. You heard what is done in Belgium?—I hear that in Belgium each side of the beef is marked three times, but, of course, when that is cut into pieces, and, of course, it is cut into an enormous number of pieces, there would be only three marks upon it. What protection is that to the public?

Mr. *Mildmay.*

703. But as regards the portions upon which those marks are put there would be protection, would there not?—It is a protection as regards those three bits; that may be three half-pounds.

704. You said there was no means of protecting the public?—I do not call that any protection.

705. Surely it is protection to a certain extent?—If you call marking three pounds out of a bullock any protection, I differ.

706. The moment you admit it is possible, with regard to certain parts of the meat, surely you admit it may become possible altogether?—I say, if you want to mark meat in such a way that the public would be protected, you destroy the value of the meat.

707. How?—In the eyes of the public; if you were to mark every mutton chop, and every rump steak, I think the public for a very considerable period would not purchase.

708. It is not proposed to do that. Do you profess to speak on the part of the retail butchers, to a certain extent?—I can only speak for the retail butchers to this extent, that a considerable number of them are members of the Chamber of Commerce, of which I am chairman of this section.

709. Are you aware that the president of the Butchers' Federation, before the Committee of the House of Lords, said he considered they would place themselves in a false position if they opposed a meat-marking Bill upon its

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

merits?—I think that is Mr. Field, is it not? I can quite understand the Dublin butchers taking that view, because they wish to go to Liverpool and buy the meat which comes in and is killed there, which, under this Bill, would be marked as British, and take it over and sell it in Dublin as British meat; I can quite understand that.

710. You said you objected to marking, because you said that all marking advertised foreign products?—Undoubtedly.

711. And increased the sale of foreign products?—Undoubtedly.

712. Are you aware that that is only the case where the foreign product is a better article than the English product; has it not acted so in the case of Sheffield cutlery; Sheffield cutlery being far better than foreign cutlery, it would hold its own, and the marking would increase the sale of Sheffield cutlery; it would only advertise foreign products and increase their sale where those foreign products were more to the taste of the customers than the English products?—And that would be the result with foreign meat.

713. But, as I understand, you choose the best refrigerated meat that comes in, and you say it is better than the second-class English meat?—I think you might put it higher than that. I think you may take it from me that the average refrigerated beef from America is decidedly better than anything like the second-class English; in fact, I am not sure it would not be better appreciated by the British public as a whole than the English beef which they are supplied with in London.

714. If a Bill for meat-marking is to be passed, do you object to the non-inclusion of live meat slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—I object to all meat-marking Bills.

715. I understand that; but if this Bill was to be passed would you prefer that foreign meat slaughtered at the port of debarkation here should be included rather than that the Bill should be passed as it is?—I think it would be a monstrous proposition to class the two together at all. I have no desire to see any meat-marking Bill at all, and nothing I have seen would make me in favour of it.

716. I understand you are opposed to meat-marking Bills, but if the majority of this Committee pass the Bill substantially as it is, would you complain that live meat slaughtered at the port of entry was not included; you referred to that clause about live meat slaughtered at the port of entry in your former evidence, you remember?—Yes, I think it is a monstrous clause.

717. Then will you answer my question?—I do not know that I can give any other answer. You asked me whether I should be better pleased with the Bill if that section were eliminated.

718. I mean, if the Bill was passed, would you prefer it in its present condition, or would you prefer the inclusion of live meat slaughtered at the port of debarkation?—Of course, every clause less in the Bill would be so much less evil, in my opinion.

719. I think

Chairman.

719. I think you said as regards the definition clause, "The words 'British or Irish meat' mean meat killed within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man." You would prefer that clause taken out?—Certainly.

720. You said that was the most monstrous clause of the Bill?—Yes.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

721. That is, I understand, because you consider that Aberdeen cattle, as you said, are far superior to any live meat that is imported from America?—Most decidedly. It is superior to anything.

722. You think if this clause is not taken out of the Bill there would thereupon be misrepresentation, and this foreign meat slaughtered at the port of debarkation would be sold as your Aberdeen meat?—I do not say that, but it would be sold as British meat; it would have the stamp of the Government upon it.

723. And that would do you injury?—Certainly. I think it would do agriculture more injury than anything I have ever heard of.

724. With regard to the suggestion that different parts of the shop should be kept for foreign and British meat, you say that small shops could not do it; surely there would be no difficulty, however small the shop was, in keeping one side of the counter for British and the other side for foreign meat?—It would be very easy to move the joints from one side to the other.

Chairman.

725. But that would be an offence?—Yes.

726. Therefore a man who was anxious to carry out the law, supposing that was the law, has only to take care that he does not in dealing with his customers move the foreign meat into the British meat department, and *vice versâ*; do you think there would be any difficulty in that?—I do. I think it would be perfectly impossible for anyone with a small shop to divide his business and carry on the two departments.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

727. If all meat were marked do you think there would be a preference shown for English grown meat?—My own idea is that in modern times the price is the first consideration with the public. I remember the time when quality was the first consideration; that time has now gone; quality is not now the first consideration.

728. You are referring to the lower classes?—I am referring to all classes; price is the first consideration with all classes now, quality is not the same consideration as it used to be, say 30 years ago. Then the primest saddle of mutton and the best sirloin of beef was considered the best thing to set upon a nobleman's table; now it is flowers, and the mutton and beef are all relegated to a side table.

729. But do you not think that the public are entitled to get this foreign meat at a price more commensurate with its value; and do you not think that a Bill that would enable the poorer classes to get foreign meat at a lower price and at a price commensurate with its value would be a great advantage to them?—There is no necessity to protect the ordinary masses of the people in London at all. At this present moment there is no deception practised. A person has only got to go to the various shops to see that he can get meat at a proper price anywhere if he will only take the trouble.

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

730. You are talking only of the lower class, I presume, because I think you said there were cases of deception?—The cases of deception I spoke of did not refer to what I may call the chance trade of the shops of London where the poor would market. It would be the middle classes that would principally deal at those shops that I had in my mind; and I think they are probably the worst marketing people of all; I think the middle-class housewife probably knows less of meat than any other person anywhere.

731. You spoke about an army of inspectors being necessary, and the tremendous expense, if this Bill were passed; are you aware that the representative of the Incorporated Society of Inspectors of Weights and Measures, in his evidence before the House of Lords Committee, gave it as his opinion that the Bill could be carried out with very little addition to the staff of inspectors, and at very little additional expense?—After a fashion, no doubt it could. That would be according to the opinion of the inspector of weights and measures, who I take it can be no very great authority as regards the inspection of meat.

732. Surely his opinion would be entitled to weight?—He is entitled to his opinion as every Englishman is; but his opinion would have no weight with me, because he is not an expert.

733. Could not inspectors practically look after very large districts; could not one inspector look after the whole of Manchester, for instance?—Certainly not. It depends entirely upon how you are going to mark the meat. If you are going to mark it only in three places and not trouble further than that, I do not know that you need trouble much about inspectors; but if you mark it in every detail, I do not know how many you would want. I have heard an estimate from a man who is in a very good position to judge, and whom I hope the Committee will have before them, the chief inspector of the Central Markets of the Corporation. He said he thought that if this were carried out, it would cost the Corporation of London over 2,000*l.* a year in increased salaries to inspectors.

Chairman.

734. Would you tell us the name of the gentleman you refer to?—Mr. Terrett.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

735. You do not agree with the evidence given by the representative of that society before this Committee?—If he said so I do not agree with him.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

736. I think you said in your evidence in chief that you were opposed to the system of marking foreign produces generally; you thought

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

thought it would only prove to the benefit of the foreign producer?—That is so.

737. As, for instance, with the Merchandise Marks Act?—That is so.

738. Of course, you are aware that that matter is being inquired into by a Committee of the House of Commons at the present time?—Yes.

739. I suppose you are against the system of marking altogether?—I am.

740. You are also opposed to the proposals in this Bill from your professional knowledge of your own business?—That is so.

741. Your position in the meat trade is that of a salesman or, as I think you said, a distributor? That is so.

742. Did you say that very often a consignment of foreign carcases might be sent to a salesman in the Central Meat Market for sale without his knowing where they came from, or what was really the origin of them?—No, I said without his knowing that they were coming. I instanced that, because it would be a hardship, for instance, to myself, in this way: I might receive a consignment, which would ultimately prove to be foreign goods, without my knowledge that it was coming. I might receive the invoice, probably by post, the same morning, hours after the goods had been exposed for sale in my shop, and the inspector might take notice of it and summon me for the offence.

743. Then would it not be an assistance to you, or to your manager, or whoever it was, if these carcases were marked?—Of course, if they were marked it would show that they were foreign, but I do not know that it would be any assistance, because they would come in hampers if they were legs of mutton, or in packages, and the package would be pitched down, and then after a little time that package would be got up, and then it would be seen what they were; but with an article that is so perishable as meat you cannot return these things. As I say, the inspector might be there, and having opened the hamper, or seeing my man open the hamper, he might say, "You have no licence to sell foreign meat; here is foreign meat upon your premises;" and then I should be liable under this Act.

744. At the present time would such a consignment be marked in any way. You, as an expert, would probably, directly you opened it, recognise it as foreign meat?—I might not. Legs of mutton or pork might come to my place, and I might sell it perfectly innocently for something else than what it was.

745. Then, surely, you will admit that it would be of assistance to you if those consignments were required to be marked by law?—I do not see what assistance it would be to me at all.

746. It would surely be of assistance to you, in case anyone consigned foreign meat to you, if it was marked, and you knew at once without doubt that it was foreign meat?—Supposing when it arrived I said, "This is foreign meat, I cannot deal in this," what is to become of the meat? In the interests of the consigner, I must dispose of it; it is a perishable article.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

747. Then have you some meat consigned to you as to which you do not know where it come from?—The great bulk of it is consigned without any advice.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

748. Have you ever at your place in the market received a consignment of that sort yourself?—I have received sometimes from Glasgow a consignment of some sides of beef that had landed, no doubt, from America, killed at Glasgow, and sent on from Glasgow to me.

749. You are not engaged in the retail trade?—No.

750. You sell to retailers?—I sell to retailers.

751. Supposing a retailer wished to have exclusively British meat, it would be a protection to him, would it not, if all foreign meat arriving at your place were marked?—I do not think the retail butcher is deceived in any way at present; I do not think there is any evidence of that. He is an expert himself, just as much as the salesman selling the goods.

752. But you say that there are some consignments of meat that you cannot tell yourself?—As regards the meat I instanced, legs of mutton and legs of pork, that might be so.

753. Do you think there is any demand on the part of the public for British meat; I mean, do you think the average purchaser of meat in a retail shop prefers British meat to foreign meat?—I do not think he cares one single straw as long as he gets it at his price and the article suits him.

754. I presume he does not like paying British price for foreign meat?—No; he would not like paying an enhanced value, of course, for foreign meat; he would want to buy in the cheapest market.

755. Under the present law, supposing a retail butcher is asked to guarantee certain meat as British, do you think on all occasions he would be able to do so honestly?—Undoubtedly. Under the present Act of Parliament, I think it is the Food and Drugs Act, if a man goes to a butcher and asks for a Scotch leg of mutton, or a piece of Aberdeen beef, and the butcher supplies anything else, he is liable to the pains and penalties under that Act, which is quite as severe as this; therefore there is no necessity for anything further there.

Chairman.

756. Does meat come under that Act?—I think so. I think all agricultural and horticultural produce was included in the Act a year or two ago.

757. You are not certain as to that, I understand?—Yes, I know it is included in some Act, and I think it is the Food and Drugs Act; but I am not quite certain which Act it is. I know anyone at present going to a butcher and asking for a piece of Aberdeenshire beef or a Scotch leg of mutton, if he is supplied with any other than that, the law is perfectly strong enough to punish that man who supplies it.

758. In

Mr. *Mildmay.*

758. In that case the purchaser must take the initiative?—It is the same if a man steals your purse; you must take the initiative.

Chairman.

759. You think that is under the Food and Drugs Act?—Yes, or the Merchandise Marks Act.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

760. Have there been any prosecutions as regards meat under that Act?—I am not aware; I do not know whether there have been or not.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

761. I was speaking rather of the position of a retail tradesman; do you think he would always know where his meat comes from; does he always know practically whether it is foreign or British?—I think, practically, he always knows.

762. I ask because, of course, very few butchers in London and other large towns kill their own meat now?—That is so.

763. They get it from salesmen?—Yes, and the reason of that is that it is impossible for a butcher nowadays in many places to sell a whole carcase, and therefore he finds it better to go to the Central Market, and purchase the particular portions he wants.

764. And you say it is difficult to distinguish joints?—It is difficult to distinguish joints.

765. Then how can these butchers you speak of know what the meat is they are getting?—The butcher does not purchase joints; he purchases considerable portions, not joints.

766. Do you think that the butcher is always in a position practically to give a guarantee if he is asked as to his meat?—Certainly.

767. He is able practically to give a guarantee that it is British?—I do not say he is in the position to give a guarantee that his meat is British, because it might be American; but he is in a position to guarantee where the meat comes from; he can tell that.

768. That is the same thing. If he can say where it comes from, he knows whether it is British or foreign?—Certainly.

769. You think when he goes to the Central Meat Market, for instance, to buy these portions of carcases, he practically always knows what they are, or whether they are foreign or British?—Certainly, if he knows his business, as I presume he would.

770. It is only when you come to the smaller joints that the difficulty arises?—Yes.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

771. In line 24, on page 3 of the Bill, it says: "The words 'British or Irish meat' mean meat killed within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man;" I think you told us that those were the four most iniquitous lines in this Bill, in your opinion?—I think they are four of the worst lines.

772. And that the Bill itself is an iniquitous proposal?—As regards the marking of meat it is not so much that I think it an iniquitous proposal as that I think it is an impossible proposal; it is impracticable, and I think would do a great deal of harm without doing any good.

Chairman.

773. When you say it is impracticable you mean in order to efficiently carry out what the object of the Bill is?—Decidedly.

774. Is it not impracticable in the sense that you could not mark meat?—No.

775. But what you mean is, that for the objects in view it would not effectually carry them out?—That is so.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

776. I gather that the reason you object so much to these four lines is that as they stand it would permit American bullocks to be killed on landing, and sent up into the Central Meat Market and come up here as best Aberdeen?—I do not say as best Aberdeen, that is a qualifying term which is not in the Bill; but they would come up as British.

777. Would they come up as Scotch?—No, as British.

778. What is there to prevent their calling it Scotch?—There is nothing to prevent their being described as Scotch; but then before they become Scotch there would have to be a great metamorphosis come over them.

779. If American cattle are slaughtered in Glasgow or in any other place in Scotland, is it legitimate to send those sides of beef up here to London, and describe them as Scotch? Suppose they are described as Scotch killed, what is to prevent them competing?—It is sailing very near the wind.

780. What is there at present to prevent any man who chooses to do so from doing it; your own trade, you tell us, is confined entirely to the very best Scotch bullocks?—That is so.

Chairman.

781. I think perhaps the short way of putting your question would be this: Would it be a legal offence to call this meat Scotch?—I do not think it would; there is nothing illegal; it would not be illegal, it would be misrepresentation, but there is nothing illegal.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

782. That is, as you say, sailing undoubtedly very close to the wind?—Yes.

783. In my opinion it is nothing short of fraud?—Quite so.

784. Because it is a misdescription of an article?—It is.

785. And it is described as Scotch in order to add a value to it which it does not intrinsically possess?—There is no question about that.

786. And your great objection to this particular portion of the Bill is that it would not prevent foreign cattle killed either in Great Britain, Ireland, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man, being afterwards described, before it reached the retailer, as a superior article?—Yes, that is wrong, and of course I object to it because it would class them along with an article very much superior to themselves.

787. Therefore, I take it, though this Bill is mainly intended to benefit the agricultural interests of this country, or rather to prevent the agriculturists of this country from being, as they say they are at the present time, defrauded

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

to a large extent, you say it has not gone in that direction at all?—Most certainly not; I think it would be the very worst thing for agriculture that could possibly be contemplated.

788. Therefore, in the interest of agriculture, it would be far better that this provision was excluded?—Yes, certainly.

789. That is your opinion?—Yes, certainly.

790. I understand that while it is possible to mark sides of beef or carcases of mutton it is impossible to mark joints or smaller portions than joints?—Without damaging the value of the article. I think that I meant that; whether I expressed it or not. Of course, it is possible to mark even a rump steak.

791. But it is practically impossible?—Yes, practically it is. The very fact of marking it, if you were to mark it in such a manner that it could be determined, would, in my opinion, deteriorate the value of the article enormously.

Chairman.

792. A rump steak, if it was marked, would have to be marked in the retail shop, would not it?—Of course, that is not quite clearly determined.

793. I mean that would be the only way of doing it, because, I understand, the steak would be cut off?—Unless you score the bullock with a red hot iron all over like a zebra. I do not know any other way that you could do it.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

794. You told us, I think, that you and other gentlemen in your business sold to the retailers in joints or in portions?—No, not in joints; we would not call them joints.

795. What do you call them; do you call them hind-quarters of mutton?—Hind-quarters of mutton, or we might dispose of legs of mutton; but then it would be in large quantities, and we might dispose of rumps in large quantities, and we might sell loins.

796. Do you think that to put three marks on a carcase of mutton on each side, as was mentioned here in evidence, would lead to this: that a chop would have to be branded. You do not sell, and gentlemen in the Central Meat Market do not sell, meat in chops and steaks?—No, I do not understand that there is any necessity for branding or marking meat to protect the wholesale trade. There is no deception in the wholesale trade; I think it is clearly laid down in this Blue Book that there is no deception.

797. I do not think any suggestion was made that there was?—No, I do not think there is any deception there.

798. But undoubtedly there is deception somewhere?—I have shown where deception exists.

799. You agree, I suppose, that all the foreign meat that comes into this country is not sold as foreign meat; that some of it finds its way to the retail shops as British or Scotch even?—I do not know about Scotch. I am not so sure about that.

800. Does any Australian mutton find its way to the consumer as Scotch?—I have told you I think probably when that trade started there might have been a little of that, but I think that the public now have been educated, and I do not think there is much of that takes place now.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

801. Is that due to the fact that the foreign produce has become of better quality than it used to be?—Partly, no doubt they have got to know better what London requires, and they have bred cattle more according to our requirements; and sheep too. They have taken our very best stock, and they have produced animals of the very same calibre in every respect.

802. You have told us that quality is not now the first consideration, that the first consideration now is price?—That is so.

803. I think you told us that the English nobleman now looks to price more than he does to quality?—That is my experience.

804. Would that account in any way for the degeneration of the English nobleman?—I think the English noblemen were never better than they are now, and if they will stick to Aberdeen meat I am certain that they will produce splendid men.

805. I think you told us that you were not at all surprised at the evidence that was given before the Select Committee of the Lords by Mr. Field?—I am not quite sure that I know what Mr. Field said.

806. I did not ask you what Mr. Field said, but I wish to remind you of what you said yourself. What did you say?—I said that Mr. Field and the other butchers in London were in favour of this Bill, and I told you the reason why, in my opinion, they were in favour of it; because I have met them in conference at the meeting of the National Federation.

807. You did not tell us this in your evidence in chief, you never said a word about meeting them in conference. Will you tell us what you said before?—What I said before was this: that I understood they would support this Bill, because they could go to Liverpool and purchase the bullocks killed there and take them to Dublin, or wherever it is that they go, and they would be British. Of course I quite understand their supporting a measure of this sort.

808. The reason they support the Bill, in your opinion, is that these gentlemen wished to sail as close to the wind as ever they could; although not committing a legal offence, performing a transaction which would not reflect credit on them as traders?—If this Bill passed they would be perfectly within their rights, and it would be perfectly fair in them to describe such things as British.

809. The insinuation against the Dublin trader is this, that he is in favour of the Bill because he wished to commit fraud?—No.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

810. There is an imputation of fraud against him?—No, there is no imputation of fraud, none intended, none expressed.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

811. Were you aware at present it is not an infraction of the law to do that, but is it not an action that does not tend to the high reputation of any trader who does so?—If this Bill passes it will not be either dishonourable or disgraceful or infringing

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

infringing the law for a man to go to Liverpool and purchase bullocks killed there, and take them to Dublin and call them British. This Act distinctly says that that is admissible, and I do not think it would be disgraceful or anything of the sort. Therefore, there is no imputation.

812. Might I draw your attention to the fact that you were commenting upon evidence given in connection with a Bill that did not contain this provision at all?—That might be so, perhaps, but that is not my intention.

813. Have you ever read this report?—Yes, I have; I have carefully studied it.

814. If you will read it you will find that this provision is not contained in the Bill on which this Committee reported?—That is very probable. My only reason for saying what I did say was that I know that is a reason why these Dublin men support this Bill. I have heard them say so themselves, and I know that that is so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

815. Do you mind giving again the reason why they support the Bill?—Because it would enable them (they are an importing country) to go to Liverpool and purchase this American meat killed in Liverpool, and it would then be British. They could have it and sell it as British.

816. As prime Aberdeen?—No, I do not say that at all. It would be impossible for them or anyone else to sell it as prime Aberdeen.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

817. I presume you must be somewhat acquainted with the trade between Great Britain and Ireland?—No, I am not much acquainted with it.

818. What do you mean by saying that Ireland is an importing country; importing what?—Importing beef; I say they could import beef from Liverpool.

819. They could?—Certainly.

820. I understood you to say that Ireland was an importing country. I do not want to put any words into your mouth that you have not used yourself. Did you use the phrase?—Very likely I did. But that is not what I meant exactly. It is a country that would perhaps require fat beef, sometimes they might have a difficulty in supplying their wants in Ireland; and they would be enabled by means of this Bill to go to Liverpool and supply their needs there.

821. Are you aware it is a notorious fact that nine-tenths of the beef produced in Ireland is sold in this country?—I do not know about beef; a great many store cattle are produced in Ireland and sent to this country.

822. If you go to the reports which you will find in the Registrar General's reports of every year you will be able to determine exactly the percentage of stores and the percentage of fat; would it surprise you to hear that the percentage of fat is very much more than you think?—I would not be surprised at anything, because I do not know anything at all about it.

823. If you do not know anything at all about it I will take it you know as little about the Dublin butcher trade?—If you please.

824. Can you produce any evidence that the

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

Dublin butchers at any time were men who were parties to any fraud in the matter of their business?—I do not impute any fraud to anybody at all. I am not thinking of such a thing. I do not think they would be capable of fraud, either Mr. Field or anybody else. I am very sorry if I have impressed you or anyone else with such an idea. I know Mr. Field, and I have the highest respect for him, and I do not think he would be guilty of fraud any more than I should.

825. Nor any of his fellow traders?—No, I have no reason to think so; certainly not; there is no intention of that sort.

826. Are you not here because this Bill is thought necessary in consequence of the pledges which have been given in England, and not because of pledges given to Ireland?—I do not know what we are here for. I am sure I cannot say.

827. We all know you come here to give evidence against the Bill, and pretty effective evidence you have given?—I am much obliged to you.

828. Can you tell me what is the relative nutritive quality as between home-grown killed meat and refrigerated meat coming from America?—No; that is a scientific question which I cannot answer.

829. Do you think that foreign refrigerated meat is as nutritive as home-grown English?—It is a scientific question, which I could not possibly answer.

830. You do not like to commit yourself either way?—It is not a question of committing myself. Any information I could give I would be very pleased to give; but what I do not know it is no use my saying.

831. One of your objections was that, in your own particular trade, although you do nothing as a matter of fact in foreign meat, possibly some foreign consignor might some day or another send a consignment to you; and if the inspector came along and found it there, he would or might take proceedings against you, although you had no intention whatever to commit an infraction of the law?—I did not say a foreign consignor; it might be some consignor from England. For instance, Dutch mutton and Dutch pigs are landed at various parts of this country.

Chairman.

832. I think we may call that foreign, may we not?—Yes, but they would be purchased by English people here, and not by foreigners. They might be consigned by a buyer who had purchased a certain quantity of these animals for his own trade and who found he did not want the whole of them, and he might send a portion of them to be sold for him in the central market.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

833. Do not you think that a butcher, whether he was an English butcher or a foreign consignor, would, if this Bill passed, make himself acquainted with those who were registered under the Bill and those who were not?—He might do so, yes.

834. Is it not a natural thing to infer that when he knew that there was a particular law on the

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

Statute Book which prevented any man, except a man who was registered, from selling foreign meat, he would acquaint himself with the names of the persons who were registered?—I am afraid my experience of consignors is that they do not take very much trouble.

835. You have told us that there was a large percentage of foreign meat as good as second-class English?—That is so.

836. I understood that to mean a large percentage of foreign refrigerated meat?—Yes.

837. What would be about the percentage?—I could not give you any percentage.

838. Is it the half of it?—I would not commit myself to any percentage.

839. Does or does not a large percentage mean more than 50 per cent.?—I think I said even further than that. I think I said that we might take it that a very large proportion was. I think I went as far as that.

840. Is the average refrigerated meat that comes over here as good as second-class English beef; if I understand, a large portion is superior?—When you say English beef, I presume that you mean the carcases of English bullocks. In London we have so few of them that really they are almost an unknown quantity.

841. When I speak of English beef, I mean beef fed in England?—Yes, I think certainly that the average American refrigerated beef is as good or better than the very best of the second-class of English-fed bullocks. That is just what I said before.

842. You told us that with even the best English-killed meat, when it is put in the refrigerator and remains in the refrigerator for a certain time, it would be almost impossible even for an expert to distinguish between it and foreign refrigerated meat?—That is so.

843. How long would it take before that process of likeness would be so complete that it would not be possible to determine?—That would depend entirely upon the temperature of the refrigerator.

844. Would it take a long time?—Not a very long time; we will say a few days. It depends entirely of course upon the temperature at which it is kept.

845. Up to that time it would be possible for an expert to determine?—Yes, I think so.

846. And after a few days your evidence would be that it would be almost impossible to determine?—In the condition of refrigeration they must get alike.

847. What I wanted to find out from you was what time would be required for that great likeness to be assumed, so that they would be similar?—I could not fix a time. I hope, Mr. Chairman, I may be allowed to make this observation. I hope I did not convey the idea that I imputed any fraud or any intention of deception to any person connected with Dublin in the way of trade. If what I said was so interpreted, I am exceedingly sorry, and I will withdraw it.

Chairman.] I think it has been quite cleared up.

Mr. *Brigg.*

848. From your position, dealing as you say you are with first-class meat, are you not one of those who would be likely to be most injured by any misrepresentation as to the origin of meat which is sold—that is to say, you have told us already that poor people who buy this meat are not deceived, but the rich people generally may be deceived, your meat going to the better-class shops?—Yes.

849. What I ask you is, are you not one of those who would be most likely to be injured by any misrepresentation on the part of those who are selling foreign meat in place of English?—If the West-end butchers who buy the article I deal in, deal largely in American, it would of course lessen the demand for my article, and, therefore, in that way, I should be in the position which you describe.

850. You consider you would yourself be in a position most likely to be injured by misrepresentation as to the origin of meat?—Certainly.

851. I would like to ask you another question which is not quite germane to the subject. From your opinion would you consider that increased importation of foreign meat would be likely to do your home supply trade much, if any, harm?—It is a very difficult question to answer. Of course the larger the importations of prime quality the more it must affect to a certain extent our article. It does do so, and it must do so as a natural consequence, although, of course, our article is a much higher priced article than any such beef, yet it is affected by the relative price of that article.

852. It is indirectly affected?—Yes.

853. You spoke about the quality of the meat that is imported here. Are you of opinion that there is any large quantity of poor meat imported at all, either frozen or refrigerated. I mean a bad quality of meat?—I am perfectly certain of this, that since we have had these large importations of foreign meat the inferior qualities of English, such as old cow and bull beef, have almost ceased to come to the metropolis. I think that the large influx of this foreign meat has raised the standard and done away with that standard of beef. It has practically ceased to come to London, at all events.

854. I take it then you state poor meat does not come from abroad?—I do not think so, no.

855. It is good quality?—Yes.

856. Then I would like to ask you as to the condition of cattle, which you call live cattle, which are slaughtered either at Deptford or Birkenhead; would you consider in the case of live cattle which have been brought from abroad the meat would be as good or equal to ordinary chilled or refrigerated meat which comes from abroad?—I think there can be no question that all modern thought tends to this, that the flesh of animals killed near their feeding grounds must be superior to the flesh of the same animals fatigued by a long railway and sea journey. I think there is no doubt about that.

857. Then you consider that the frozen and chilled meat which we buy is as good as that meat which is killed at Birkenhead or Deptford?—I will not say as to the frozen meats because it

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

it comes from another country. Frozen meat is entirely Australian, New Zealand, and South American, and so on. I should say that, of course, I do not think it advisable to promote any one particular trade at the expense of another, but certainly I think that the flesh of animals that is killed near its own feeding ground is superior to the flesh of the same animals after they have undergone a long journey. Take 20 animals in Chicago. Kill 10 of them and send them over here by refrigerator and send 10 of them alive by rail and let them undergo a long sea journey and I should certainly say that the flesh of the 10 animals killed in Chicago must be better food than the flesh of the others killed in this country; I think that is incontrovertible.

858. You spoke as to the appearance of meat, and I think you spoke of the difficulty there was in detecting the quality of it. I suppose it really is often a question of dryness, that is the outside of the meat becomes dry and of course the colour of the blood changes. You would be able to judge of the meat in the same way as you would distinguish meat that is fresh killed and meat that has been in a butcher's shop say for a week or five or six days exposed, you would see the difference?—Yes.

859. Now, I want to ask you a question based on that. In retail shops suppose the outer surface of the meat was removed could you by any possibility, or could any expert by any possibility, detect the origin of that meat?—No, I do not think he could. I do not think any one could tell with certainty. Supposing two sides of beef are placed in a refrigerator and remain there for some time until they would resemble American, I do not think it would be possible if they were cut into pieces to know it from refrigerated American. I think there might be a difficulty about it. I am not quite so certain of it, but I think it would be a very difficult thing to determine. There might arrive a time, as I say, when it would be almost impossible to tell.

860. And you judge, I suppose, entirely by sight?—It is entirely a question of sight. There is no other test for meat but a practised and educated eye.

861. You would be guided by appearance?—Undoubtedly.

862. And that appearance might be caused by refrigeration which would equally affect almost all meat?—Undoubtedly.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

863. I think your chief objection to this Bill is based upon the inconvenience it would cause traders in the way of marking, and the difficulty of getting proper inspectors to see that it is carried out. That is your chief difficulty?—That is one great point.

864. If the Committee can succeed in removing those difficulties then they would remove your opposition to the Bill?—That would be to remove the meat marking altogether.

865. Will you be kind enough to give a plain answer to a plain question. If the Committee can remove this difficulty about marking and inspection will you withdraw your objection to the Bill?—I do not think there would be any Bill left.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

866. You can answer the question?—If you remove all the difficulties about marking and the difficulty about inspection, I should have no objection excepting the one which I mentioned to you before. It was mentioned by your friend on your right with regard to the cattle being classed as British.

867. Is that when you import British cattle to Ireland?—No.

Chairman.

868. This Bill includes those cattle that are killed here as British. You say they ought to be treated as foreign?——

Mr. *MacAleese.*

869. Do you think that taking meat from Liverpool over to Dublin and marking it "British" would be an inducement to the people of Dublin to buy it rather than if it were marked "Irish"?—I do not think that is so.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

870. You have just answered the question that your objections to this Bill would have been removed if the marking difficulty was got over. I wish you to reconsider that answer?—I also mentioned the other clause that I object to There are several clauses besides marking.

871. I wish to ask you a few questions in your capacity as farmer. This Bill is professedly to help agriculturists?—I am sorry to hear that, as I do not think it will.

872. But it is professedly to help agriculturists?—Yes.

873. I wish to know in your opinion as a farmer, would it raise the price of our fat cattle?—Certainly not; most certainly not.

874. Yesterday you heard the evidence of the secretary of the Central Association?—I did.

875. He said, I think, farmers in England were almost unanimously in favour of this Bill. Do you remember that?—I do.

876. And his opinion was the same as yours, that it would not raise the price of beef. He was then asked the question why they were in favour of it. He said because they like fair play. Now I want to ask you this: Are farmers in Scotland so very keen about fair play that they would run the risk of having this Bill passed and the price of their fat cattle put down in order to see fair play?—I can say a good deal for the Scotch farmers, but I am afraid I cannot quite answer that question. I think Scotch farmers are like English farmers; they would advocate anything that they thought would enhance the value of their produce.

877. Then if the English farmers are so keen about it, they must think they are going to enhance the price of their fat cattle?—I have not the least doubt that would be their object.

878. That you think is their object?—I have no doubt about it.

879. The sentimental idea of fair play is nonsense?—I should say so, but of course that is only an opinion.

880. If this marking of foreign meat was carried out, and the trade was confined to licensed

Sir *John Kinloch*—continued.

shops and to registered traders, and if the foreign meat is really the good article which you think it is, and if it can be sold at 3*d.* or 4*d.* a pound cheaper than our meat, do not you think it would be probable that the public might take comfortably to the cheaper shops and desert the dearer home-fed beef?—I have not the least doubt that marking of meat would advertise the foreign; I have no doubt about it.

881. The great consumers of our meat are the middle and poorer classes; the rich do not count very much as against them?—I think the rich consume more per head of the population than the poorer.

882. But the great bulk of our consumers are the poorer and middle classes?—Yes.

883. They would naturally turn to the cheaper shops?—I have no doubt.

884. Would not the result of that be that it would fetch down the price of our home-fed meat?—I think so. I think that the whole tendency of this Bill is against agriculture. As an agriculturist myself I can see that quite plainly. I may be wrong in my idea, but what I should like to mention is this: that I can hardly conceive how the agriculturists who were mentioned here yesterday could have been possessed of the information concerning this Bill, and could have given all these instructions, considering the short time that this Bill has been in print. I confess myself that I had a great deal of difficulty in obtaining a copy of this Bill, and it was not until almost the second reading of the Bill that I could obtain a copy. How this Bill could have been considered by this enormous number of agriculturists I cannot understand. I could have understood that they had considered meat-marking Bills which had come before the House of Commons before, but I cannot conceive how they can have had this particular Bill before them and considered it.

Chairman.

885. This Bill was printed on the 22nd of January of this year, there have been six months; do not you think that is a sufficient time?—It may be sufficient time, but I am inclined to think that many of these recommendations which were there made refer to some previous Bills that were before the House rather than to this one in particular, because I think you will remember that the witness who appeared yesterday spoke to their objections regarding that clause of making foreign meat killed in Great Britain and Ireland British. Now that was not in the former Bill.

886. I am mistaken in saying it was printed on the 22nd of January; it was ordered to be printed on that date?—Quite so.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

887. Then your opinion as a farmer is that we run a very great risk of having our fat cattle brought down in price?—I think it would undoubtedly tend to that.

888. And you think that this time of agricultural depression is not a time to run risks of that sort?—I should think not.

889. At least it is not for us farmers to try and help forward legislation to hurt ourselves; but I suppose you will acknowledge it will do good to the general public by advertising foreign meat, and the general public will go to the cheaper place?—That is my opinion certainly.

Sir *John Kinloch*—continued.

890. We were told yesterday in the evidence that about 800,000 tons of foreign meat come to this country. Does much of that come to Smithfield Market?—I think in this return which is here from the Lords, it is said one-third of the whole consumption of the country is foreign, but I should like this Committee to observe that I am perfectly sure that that does not apply to the metropolis. From my experience I should say that certainly two-thirds of the meat consumed in the metropolis is foreign.

891. A great quantity of this frozen meat killed at Deptford goes to Smithfield?—Yes, and it passes through the central market at Smithfield.

892. Is a great quantity of this foreign meat that is sold at Smithfield sold as home meat?—No; there is nothing sold in Smithfield as home meat that is foreign; nothing at all.

893. It is after it gets outside of Smithfield the deception goes on?—Yes, certainly; it would be in the retail shops. There is no deception practised at Smithfield at all, not that I ever observed; I do not think there is such a thing.

894. Can you give us an idea of the present price for the best home. What is the Aberdeen beef per cwt.?—You see, the difficulty is there are no sides of beef coming from Aberdeen. But the value of what is called there short sides of beef in our market to-day would be about 7¼*d.* or 7½*d.* per pound by the piece, that is to say, 4*s.* 10*d.* or a crown per stone for the short side.

895. How does that compare with the price of foreign?—I may mention that the price of the primest roast beef out of such pieces as that, the wholesale price (I am speaking of what I have myself done to-day), would amount to probably 10½*d.*, and in some cases 11*d.* a pound.

896. The best roast beef?—The best roast beef.

897. And what is the best foreign roast beef?—I should say myself 8*d.* to 8½*d.*; that is of the beef killed in London, and I imagine that the refrigerated would be very much the same thing; perhaps the very best of it would be about that price.

Chairman.

898. How much do you say the foreign?—8*d.* to 8½*d.* I should say, but I am not engaged in that trade, so that really I am giving you now an opinion. The price of the Aberdeen meat, of course, I know well.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

899. I wanted to know the difference?—Well, it is something like that; 10½*d.* to 11*d.* and 8*d.* to 8½*d.* That is near enough for practical purposes.

Chairman.

900. You are taking the very maximum price in both cases, and the wholesale price?—Yes; that is for the very best article.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

901. The best foreign would be 8½*d.*?—Yes; 8½*d.* would be the price for the best foreign.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

902. If you were buying prime Aberdeen, and you would pay 54*s.* a cwt. dead weight, what would you pay for the dead weight of a frozen carcase per cwt.?—54*s.* a cwt. is practically 6*d.* a pound. Well, a Deptford side of beef to-day in the market, that is to say, the very best States bullock killed at Deptford, would be worth about 3*s.* 6*d.*; 5¼*d.* a pound.

903. And the best Scotch 6*d.*?—No; if there were any sides of beef from Scotland to-day they would be worth 4*s.* 4*d.* or 4*s.* 6*d.*

904. There are one or two points in this printed evidence of yours that I would like a little amplified. You say, "the proposed registration will be of no avail, as there are things, sweetbreads for instance, for which at times every butcher is dependent upon foreign supplies, and therefore practically every retail butcher would have to register"?—Yes.

905. Is it your opinion that universal registration would be necessary?—If a butcher were to supply his customers with such articles as sweetbreads or calves' heads, or very frequently veal of the best quality, he must get it from abroad.

906. And butchers who would not supply that article would run a risk?—They would run the risk of losing their customers.

907. You in your printed evidence refer to 40 carcases of New Zealand mutton being sent to Aberdeen for sale by auction. I think we should have that on our notes?—I say that sometimes even an expert may get deceived, and I give an instance of a consignment of 40 carcases of New Zealand mutton that were sent to Aberdeen from London and sold by auction. The purchaser reconsigned six of those carcases to a salesman in the Central Market, and they were there sold at 2*s.* per stone profit, the salesman simply remarking that they arrived in a very bad and wet condition.

908. In the next paragraph to that in your printed evidence you say, "you cannot tell anything by analysing the meat, and a large piece is required upon which to form even an opinion." What do you mean by that?—I mean to say it would be utterly impossible to determine what a bullock was or what a side of beef was by a piece; it would be necessary to have a very large quantity. I am not sure what that quantity would be. It would be certainly a fore-quarter, but I should prefer to see a side. I do not think any person by seeing a piece could determine what it was cut from with any certainty at all.

909. Then an inspector would take a quarter of an animal and without payment?—There is no weight here fixed.

910. But if a large piece is necessary, and you say it could not be done under a quarter, he would take that without any payment?—Certainly.

911. Do you approve of that?—No, I think it is, as it were, imputing guilt where it may never exist. You see the man taking something implies that there is a reason for so doing, and after having examined it he may come to the conclusion that there is no offence, and therefore he himself has committed a wrong act.

Chairman.

912. That is the practice, is it not, under the Food and Drugs Act?—I do not know what the practice is.

913. I think they can take samples under that Act?—I do not know that that applies to meat.

914. But other things?—That may be so; I am not aware of that.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

915. Then in the next paragraph of your printed evidence you complain that samples may be taken of food which no offence is provided for by the Bill?—Yes.

916. For instance a sample might be taken of a rabbit, but there is no offence?—That is so.

917. I see you approve of a tribunal of appeal?—I cannot conceive of any better plan than that for assisting the accused. It might be possible to do what is done, I believe, though I am not sure, at Birmingham. I think there are nominated by the municipal authorities, juries of experts, whom a butcher can call in, in the event of any dispute arising between him and the inspector, so that the matter can be settled at once on the evidence before them. I think that is a very fair method of determining any dispute that may arise.

Chairman.

918. You said, I think, that a rabbit can be taken under the Bill as a sample, and yet there is no offence with regard to a rabbit; is that so?—Yes, I think under the Bill it is so.

919. It is referred to in Clause 7 of the Petition?—Yes.

920. The allegation is that, "That the clause empowers the taking of samples of meat, as to which no offence under the Act could by possibility be committed, inasmuch as 'foreign meat,' as to which alone an offence could be committed, is (by Clause 15) limited to 'the flesh of cattle, sheep, or swine,' whereas 'meat' includes (by Clause 15) 'the flesh of any animal commonly used for human food'"?—Quite so.

921. That is a drafting clause; I do not suppose it was intended?—That may be.

922. You point out in that clause what would be technically "meat" might be taken, and yet there would be no offence, because it is not specified as a kind of meat against which an offence could be committed?—Yes.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

923. When did you see this Bill?—I think the first time we could get a copy of it was the day before the second reading.

924. It was only issued on the 2nd April?—The 2nd April was the date it was issued.

Mr. *Doughty.*

925. You referred a little while ago to, I think it was, the Sussex Farmers' Association and one or two other associations of farmers in London that trade as butchers, and you said that passing these shops you might see nothing hung there but American beef. Are we to understand that farmers trading as butchers in London practise fraud to the extent of stocking their shops entirely with American?—No; there is

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

no farmers' association in this case that I have mentioned; it is a private individual trading under that name; that is a deception, it is a private individual. It is not confined to the meat trade alone; you will see "Wine-growers' Association," and various other associations of that sort, who are simply individuals using that as a name which they think will go down probably with the public.

926. Do you imply this, then, that those persons are presumably dealing in English beef and at the same time are giving to the public foreign meat?—No, I say that the bulk of the stuff that I have seen in their premises is foreign.

927. Then we are to understand by that, I suppose, that the great proportion of best beef sold in the best shops in London is not English beef?—Of course it is not English in the sense that you mean, cattle bred or fed in England. There is a very small portion of that, indeed, in the metropolis, so small that I am afraid to mention how small it is. The English farmer has been practically driven out of the London trade altogether; that is a fact; and he will be altogether if they do away with private slaughter-houses in London. The only customers he has got left now are those butchers who have private slaughter-houses of their own, and who still buy English bullocks and slaughter them. But if they do away with these slaughter-houses, and there seems to be a very general feeling among our authorities that that ought to be done, then I think the very last customer, as far as the metropolis is concerned, for his bullocks in England will be gone, and a good many Scotch too.

928. Can you give us any special reason why the English farmer is driven out of the London markets?—Because he cannot possibly compete with the Americans.

929. Then it is purely, in your opinion, a question of price?—It is purely a question of competition. He cannot possibly send his articles to be sold in competition with the Americans. You see, the great bulk of the English beef, or a very considerable portion of it, is not of the same excellence as the Scotch; I mean of what comes to London; I am talking about what comes to London. Of course there may be some equally good bullocks in some parts of the country, but they do not come to London. I am talking principally about the great metropolis, and I say that he is practically handicapped out of the London trade; he does not send bullocks to London.

930. Do not you see that the main object of this Bill is to endeavour to obviate that difficulty, that is, to indicate to persons purchasing that the article they are now getting is foreign and not English?—I do not know what the object of the Bill is; it may be ambiguous.

931. Now I ask you a similar question with respect to the provinces. It is evident from your evidence that you think most of the beef consumed in London is foreign. Do you think the same obtains in respect to the country towns?—No, I do not think that the same proportion, or anything like it, would hold good in the country at all. I think the metropolis is the great consumer of foreign meat. Of course they

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

are the largest consumers of every meat, but I think a larger proportion would be consumed in London than probably any other large town.

932. From your experience of the Central Meat Market, with which you are connected, do you know whether any of the better butchers, say in Manchester, or even in the smaller towns, deal in foreign beef?—There is no doubt there is a very large trade done in that way. Meat is sent from London to these various places, the portions of beef that they require. Take Brighton and Eastbourne and all those towns in the South of England; they are very largely supplied with the prime portions of, we will say, refrigerated beef or American beef to supplement local supplies.

933. Then we may take it as your opinion that the larger portion of the better country butchers buy the best kind of foreign beef to sell to their customers?—I have no doubt they do buy a large quantity.

934. With respect to British agriculture, I think I understood you to say that, in your opinion, this Bill would be injurious to the British farmer. Why do you think so?—Because I think it would advertise foreign meat at his cost. That is one thing. And it would do him a serious injury to have his bullocks classed as "British" along with those animals which it is proposed to class as "British" here.

935. Do you think the giving a label (for it would be in the nature of a label) or a character to foreign beef that has this mark would have a tendency to increase the price of better class foreign beef?—I do not know about increasing the price. I do not think there is anything in that way that would increase the price of foreign meat.

936. How would it compete with the best kinds of English beef unless it did?—You see the price is lower; it is very much lower. It competes there; it comes to a considerable amount less. When I say a considerable amount, an appreciable amount, at all events, less.

937. But if this marking advertises the excellence of a certain portion of this foreign beef, would it not have a tendency, at least, to create a greater demand for it on the market, and, consequently, would it not realise a better price?—You see, they send it in such large quantities that they can almost cope with any demand. With these men who are engaged in this American trade, quantity, I think, has almost nothing to do with what they can send. The quantity they can send is enormous, provided it can realise a price which will remunerate them in a small degree.

938. It has been suggested, on the other hand, this morning, I think, that if this meat were marked it might be an advantage to the very poor people; that is, the poorer qualities of it might make less than at the present time, and to that extent it would be a benefit to the poor. Do you think that?—No, I do not. I do not think that the poor have anything to complain of in any shape or form.

939. I am not asking you whether they have anything to complain of?—I think they get their meat at a very very small profit indeed.

940. That

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

940. That does not answer my question. What I wanted you to answer is this. Do you think that the effect of marking meat will reduce the price of it to the poor?—No, I do not think so at all.

941. And you do not think it would increase the price?—I do not think it would have that effect. I think it would increase the demand after a bit, if the meat were marked. The advertising of it would increase the demand. That is a different thing from increasing the price.

942. I understand you to mean then that the increase in demand would to that extent injure the British farmer?—Yes, decidedly so. That is what I mean, but I am sorry I am so dull.

943. Therefore this Bill, instead of being a boon to the British farmers, would be a decided danger to them?—Most decidedly, that is my candid opinion.

944. Now, about these inspectors. You have given us some information on the subject. Do you think that one inspector would be sufficient for the Central Market?—Oh, dear no. I think we now have four or five.

945. I mean for this particular market. Suppose the Committee decide, for example, that it does not apply to the wholesale trade, but only to the retail trade?—I could not possibly answer; but I think if you were to have Mr. Terrett, the chief inspector, before you, he would be a far better authority on this matter, and he is a most excellent and able officer. I think you would be able to get a valuable amount of information from such an officer as that.

Chairman.

946. He is an officer of the Corporation?—He is an officer of the Corporation.

Mr. *Doughty.*

947. But if this Bill could be of any benefit at all, I understand from you that you say it must be to the retailer. It cannot affect the wholesale man at all you say, there is no fraud there?—There is no fraud there.

948. Now supposing that it is so applied that all smaller portions of meat have to be marked, I take it there would have to be an expert inspector in every small town?—Of course it would depend upon the trade that was done, but I think it would require a whole army of inspectors if every small joint was to be marked in that way. I think that it would want an enormous staff.

949. Now supposing that the Bill is passed and that a butcher becomes registered, and he deals in both kinds of beef, and he has both kinds of beef on his stall, and the customer comes and he sells foreign beef for English beef, would it be possible to detect that if the beef is taken away?—Of course, that would depend entirely upon whether the customer laid information. If the customer took that joint home and sold it, it would be very difficult, of course, to get it, but if the buyer laid information and got into contact with the inspector there could be no difficulty.

950. You think the inspector could tell?—You mean whether it was foreign meat?

951. Would he be able to say on his oath that it was either English or foreign?—I should not like to give an opinion. My own opinion is that it would be enormously difficult to tell, and that instances might readily arise, even in the case of New Zealand mutton, where it would be almost impossible to tell with any certainty whether it was New Zealand or whether it was Scotch.

952. And you think no wise man on his oath would really say?—I think he would be very foolish to hazard an opinion of that sort, I do not know anyone who would.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

953. I want to ask you a technical question first. It has been suggested to me that there is a difference in the way the meat is dressed, whether it is British meat or American meat; that American meat is not dressed in the same way as British?—Do you refer to the chilled beef from America; the refrigerated beef from America?

954. Yes, I should like to have that first; refrigerated meat?—Of course, there may be a little difference in the dressing; I am not quite certain as to that; but that is not anything of any consequence. It would not be so different that any one would be likely to know it at a glance.

955. That would not aid anybody in saying whether it was British or foreign?—No, I do not think it would.

956. Is there a difference between the way in which the meat at the port of disembarkation is dressed and that of English meat?—No; that is dressed in the English fashion, but there has been a custom lately—it was introduced some years ago—of dressing a good many of these bullocks in the same way as the Aberdeen bullocks used to be dressed, and that refers practically to the way that they divide the bones in the fore quarter. The Aberdeen people have a peculiar way of their own. When I say Aberdeen I mean the whole of the trade in Scotland; I do not refer to that one particular county. It is dressed in a particular way; different to what used to be the English fashion. But that method has been adopted. I am not prepared to say why it was adopted; but it was adopted, and it is adopted in some cases now.

957. That is peculiar to Aberdeen?—It used to be peculiar to Aberdeen; it is not peculiar now, because it has spread a good deal. I do not mean abroad, but in this country.

958. In this country is all meat dressed alike now?—There are two forms of dressing: the old Aberdeen style and the old English style. It is a difference in the division of the bone of the fore-quarter.

959. Then there are two styles in England?—Yes.

960. And the foreign meat is occasionally dressed in one style and occasionally in the other?—No, I should think the refrigerated beef is always dressed in what we call the English style; that is, in the division of the bones.

961. And the live meat killed in this country?—As to the bullocks that are killed in this country, some butchers have a fancy for one

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

dressing and some for another, and they are not always dressed in one way.

962. Is the Liverpool meat dressed differently?—Some one way, and some the other.

963. Are Birkenhead and Deptford alike?—One man prefers one way of dressing and he dresses them so, and another prefers another way.

964. Would all meat at Birkenhead be dressed in one way?—No, that is not so. They may dress it in "Aberdeen fashion," as it is locally termed, or they may dress it in English fashion.

965. In the same lairage?—Yes.

966. Have you ever seen the Birkenhead lairages?—No, I am sorry to say I have not.

967. You are a farmer, as well as a wholesale butcher?—I was going to say I am sorry I am, but I do not say that.

968. You are an Aberdeenshire farmer?—Yes.

969. Your beef is famous, of course, all over the world; it is bred chiefly from shorthorn stock?—Of course we have very valuable shorthorns in Aberdeenshire, but they are used principally by the farmers for crossing black-polled cows.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

970. And blue greys?—There are a good many blue greys, of course.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

971. At any rate, you have a great many famous breeds there?—Yes.

972. And foreigners come from all parts of the world to buy them?—That is so.

973. Where do the bulk of them go?—Of course the great bulk of them have recently been going to South America.

974. To Argentina?—Yes; a great many.

975. And to North America, I suppose, a good many?—A great many have gone to North America, but there has not been such a demand for them recently as for Buenos Ayres and South America.

976. There is very fertile land in Argentina?—Yes.

977. And in Canada also during part of the year?—No doubt about it.

978. Then cattle bred from similar sires on good pastures would be practically as good quality meat as English meat?—No, they do not produce as good quality beef. They produce as beautiful bullocks in shape, but it is the soil that produces the quality of the beef. It is no use anyone thinking anything different; that is the fact; it is the soil. It is what grows upon the soil that puts the value of quality into the flesh of an animal. Although you may get the shape as beautiful in those countries as the forefathers, you may say, of these animals, yet their flesh is not the same.

979. If you had an equally fertile soil in Argentina or Canada, would you not get the same class of bullock?—I do not think so. I do not think that there is any country that I have ever seen yet (I do not know whether there will be) that can produce the same quality of beef as the North of Scotland.

980. Have you seen the cattle at Deptford?—

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

Yes, many times. I am on the Cattle Markets Committee of the Corporation of London, and it is my business to do so.

981. Where do they come from?—From the States and Argentina and so on; there is nothing comes from the Continent of Europe, nothing allowed to come.

982. A great many of them look just like English cattle?—They look like English and Scotch; you will find rows of them, black-polled Angus bullocks, as good as possible as regards breed, Devons and Herefords, and shorthorns.

983. Do they often show signs of serious injury during the voyage?—No, I do not think so. I think they come over in very excellent condition. A return was prepared, and if it would interest you I think it might easily be obtained, by the Corporation as to the condition in which the animals arrived at the foreign market, the small percentage that were lost in transit from the various places where those animals came to that wharf. It was prepared a short time ago, and I have not the least doubt the Corporation would be pleased to supply you with it.

984. They are bred from equally good stock as most of the British cattle?—Yes.

985. And they are sent over in very good condition, and except for the difference in the soil they would be equal to the best English cattle, we will not say equal to your prize variety, but to everything short of the prize Aberdeen?—They are most excellent, that is all I can say.

986. And when you speak of the foreign price, you told us that the best price for foreign meat was 8½*d.*?—Roast beef; sides, 3*s.* 6*d.*

987. Would that be refrigerated?—Well, refrigerated would be about the same; but it also would include the better part of States cattle that had come to Deptford and been slaughtered there.

988. It would be, perhaps, more likely to be the cattle slaughtered at the port of disembarkation than the frozen meat?—I do not give that price as an absolute fact, because, as I think I mentioned, I do not deal in that article; it is only hearsay.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

989. Do you mean frozen or chilled?—Chilled.

990. All through your evidence, when you have spoken of refrigerated meat, you have meant chilled meat?—Quite so. The frozen meat comes from another country altogether.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

991. You have been asked the question before to-day, I think, but I should like to get it a little more fully. You know there have been one or two Bills before, and there was a Bill last year; which did not include this clause to which you take so much objection, this clause permitting live cattle, killed at the port of disembarkation, to be considered British. Did your Chamber oppose that Bill?—They would have done so, certainly, if it had been necessary for them to take steps to oppose it. If that Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, which

was

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

was proposed once, we should certainly have opposed it.

992. As strongly as you did this?—Of course, it had not got that very objectionable clause, which to my mind is very fatal.

993. Do you think you would have a better chance of opposing a Bill if all the meat trade were agreed about it, or do you think you would have a better chance by opposing it in sections?—I am afraid that is more a question for you than for me.

994. I presume that the hardship of that clause would only affect the very best Scotch; this States beef and Argentina beef which is brought in cold would not compete with any other?—I am giving you a very extreme case, as I admit, and I am sure if you saw the carcases of those animals yourself you would think it would be a very great hardship indeed upon any English or Scotch farmer that such an animal as that should be classed as British. I hope that you will come and see them.

995. You admit that in many cases it would be impossible to tell them?—Decidedly; there are some magnificent animals.

996. And a very large proportion of them are magnificent animals?—A very large proportion of the States cattle are magnificent animals.

997. Where would the hardship come in; there would be no hardship upon the consumer, I presume, if that meat should be classed as "British"?—I think it would be a hardship upon the consumer. You see on one side of a street a man selling the poorest Argentina bullocks that he could find, labelled "British," and a man on the opposite side of the street selling Scotch, and that is labelled "British" too. I think it is a hardship all round.

998. Supposing a man is sending the very best cattle from the States or Argentina labelled "British," and a man on the other side of the street is selling the very worst English meat?—Of course, the same kind of hardship would not exist in that case, because you are reversing things.

999. Is it not all a question of price?—I do not quite follow.

1000. If the consumer gets the value of his money, is there any hardship involved whether the designation is British or foreign?—There is not a very great difference unless when he distinctly wishes a particular article. I presume every man who has a wish to be supplied with English or Scotch would feel it a hardship upon him if he had imposed upon him foreign. If he was prepared to pay English or Scotch price, I do not think that man ought to have foreign.

1001. I take it, any man selling foreign meat now at English prices, if he represents it as English meat, already comes within the law?—Yes, certainly.

1002. You have explained that to us, I think, very fully?—Certainly.

1003. Then where would be the hardship, supposing this clause allowing Argentina or States beef to be sold as English were passed; the only hardship would be the designation?—The hardship, I think, would be that it would damage the home-producer. I think it would be very much against the interests of the home-producer; I do, indeed.

1004. The consumer would not get an inferior article?—Yes, if he was having some of these wild cattle from South America, he would have a very inferior article indeed.

1005. The great bulk of them are superior?—Not Argentina cattle. They may be in some years to come, but they are not at present. There are some good bullocks which come from South America, but a very, very few at present. Doubtless we shall get them better after years and years.

1006. You have told us that the Bill would be a great advertisement to foreign meat; if that foreign meat is inferior to English meat, how would advertising benefit it?—I do not say it is inferior to English meat. I say that there is a great proportion of it that is superior or quite equal to anything but the very best English meat. I do not say it is inferior.

1007. Then I take it the only hardship is where foreign meat is sold as British, and the only hardship to the consumer is where foreign meat is sold as British meat?—Quite so.

1008. The quality is equally good; he does not get inferior quality; and that is already guarded against in the present law?—I am not one of those people who think that the British public is very much defrauded; I do not think so, indeed.

Chairman.

1009. You are acquainted with the Report of the Lords Committee, and I want to ask you a general question upon it, because I have not had an opportunity of examining it carefully. I want to know whether I am correct in this, that the Lords Committee did not make any recommendation for marking meat?—I think they had a very great difficulty about arriving at any conclusion with regard to marking. That, I think, is clearly set out here.

1010. At any rate, it is not in the summary of their recommendations?—It is not.

1011. In the first Report they do not make any recommendation?—They had a great difficulty in making up their minds. You will see by the evidence which is there given there was great diversity of opinion.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

1012. Did I understand you to say, in reply to Sir John Kinloch, when you were talking about the difference between the price of Aberdeen and the price of foreign at Deptford, that there was only one penny a pound difference?—No, I did not say that.

1013. What was the difference?—I said the price of American sides of beef to-day in the central markets was, I think about 3*s.* 6*d.*, that is the carcase; and I think that the price of Aberdeen sides of beef to-day in London would be about 4*s.* 6*d.* if there had been any, but I hardly think there was an Aberdeen side of beef in the market to-day. They are not in the habit of sending them in the warm weather. They use the inferior pieces at home.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1014. You told us something about the Belgian provision, that the lungs should be attached to the meat. I presume that is to enable the inspector to ascertain in a moment whether the meat is affected with tuberculosis?—No doubt; but you see the effect of that would be to prohibit the importation to Belgium of carcases. I understood yesterday, doubtless it was owing to my own inattention, that Mr. Jefferys in giving his evidence said that this stamp included not only the abattoir it was killed at but also the source of origin; and I think by that he implied that there was foreign meat imported into Belgium.

Chairman.

1015. I think he did, because he mentioned the port of Antwerp?—I cannot say.

1016. And he also, in answering a question of mine, mentioned carcases that might be brought over the boundary?—I know in London a butcher who had a customer here who purchased some joints of meat wished to make presents in Belgium, and they were seized in Belgium, and he was notified that he would be proceeded against because he had broken the law; that no meat would be allowed to enter the country unless the lungs were attached to it.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1017. May I ask you upon that whether you have come across much tuberculosis in your trade?—I gave evidence before the Tuberculosis Commission. I do not see much tuberculosis; but then the whole of the meat is inspected before I see it. The great bulk of it would be inspected previous to my seeing it, and therefore I should see very little of it indeed; yet that is not a reason why it may not be there.

1018. There is much tuberculosis amongst Scotch cattle?—I should say there has been a considerable amount.

1019. Is there much among the cattle landed at Deptford?—Very little indeed, I should think; extremely little. I think it is almost unknown among American cattle.

1020. The foreign cattle are really freer from tuberculosis than British cattle?—I think that is undoubtedly the fact.

1021. And if the British retail butcher and consumer knew that to be the fact, it is quite possible that they might prefer to buy the foreign?—I think the inspection of meat now is very good, and I do not think that there is anything that the public need dread of unwholesome food reaching them.

1022. But the retail butcher suffers considerably now, does not he, occasionally?—I think the retail butcher who purchases animals alive is very hardly dealt by indeed.

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

1023. And therefore he has every inducement to buy foreign animals at present?—I would not go so far as that.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1024. With regard to the question about the lungs in Belgium, may it not arise in this way. I do not know whether you may be able to give us information as to whether cattle are imported alive there, and killed at the port of disembarkation, and stamped with that stamp which Mr. Jefferys showed us yesterday?—Yes, that might be so. I have avoided thinking what Mr. Jefferys said was not absolutely correct, because I am perfectly sure that he would take care that he knew the facts.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

1025. What would be the best day for the Committee to go down to Deptford and inspect for themselves?—Any day that will suit the Committee. May I be in order in saying that we should be very pleased indeed if you gentlemen could visit the Central Markets. We would take very good care that you had an opportunity of seeing for yourselves all the various sorts of meats which are to be seen in the metropolis. It would not take you very long, and we would endeavour to make your labours as light as possible. I also understand that an invitation to visit the Corporation Markets will be given, and I think by this means you would become better acquainted with the various sorts of meat than by anything that I or any other witness could be able to tell you. I hope you will find it convenient to accept that invitation, and I will make arrangements with your Clerk to make it as easy and light as possible.

Chairman.

1026. I am sure we are much obliged for the suggestion, and the Committee will consider it. Do I understand that any time would suit you?—Any time that you choose to mention.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1027. Could we see the Deptford lairages at the same time?—That is some distance off. I think you would have to have an afternoon or something of that sort at your disposal when you went to Deptford.

1028. And Islington?—Islington is at present like a deserted village.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1029. I take it you do not say that regularly frozen meat is as good as fresh?—No, there is not the least doubt about it that the process of freezing caused deterioration.

Tuesday, 13*th July* 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sir William Houldsworth.	Mr. Kilbride.
Mr. Brigg.	Sir John Kinloch.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Doughty.	Mr. Mildmay.
Mr. Hozier.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.	Mr. Parker Smith.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. THOMAS DAVIES, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1030. YOU are Chairman of the Wirrall Farmers Club?—Yes.

1031. Can you tell me exactly what the Wirrall Farmers Club is?—It is a combination of farmers in the district of the Hundred of Wirrall, or Wirrall Peninsular, that is from Chester to Birkenhead or Hoylake. It is, I daresay, 28 miles long and about eight or nine miles across.

1032. Is it confined to the farmers in that district?— Not necessarily. Nearly all the farmers belong to it, but we do not confine it to farmers. If anybody will do us any good we are pleased to have them as members.

1033. How many members have you?—About 150 or 160; something of that sort.

1034. You are able to give us some evidence first of all as to the facts, and then as to the opinions of the farmers in that district on the meat question?—Yes.

1035. Are you also prepared to give evidence with regard to the making of cheese?—I do not think that would affect us very much. I think we are quite agreed with the Bill as regards cheese being marked.

1036. I was not asking your opinion at the moment. I was asking whether you could give evidence?—I think we all quite agree with the Bill.

1037. I only ask you whether you will be able to give us the opinions of your farmers on cheese?—Yes, I can.

1038. Now as regards the Bill, you want to make some remarks on Clause 5 of the Bill?—Yes.

1039. That clause is this: "It shall not be lawful for any person to keep for sale, or have in his possession for the purposes of sale, or sell or expose for sale, or deal in foreign meat, unless he is registered as a dealer in foreign meat according to this Act." What do you say as to that?—I should like to add, in addition to that, that any person who is licensed for the sale of foreign meat should also have above his shop or place of business, printed in such characters or letters that the public might see that that

Chairman—continued.

person was registered for the sale of foreign meat.

1040. That is, in addition to the fact of registration you wish that the shop itself should be marked in some prominent way, so that the public can see that he is a seller of foreign meat?—Quite so.

1041. Is there nothing in the Bill which would enact that?—I do not think so; not in regard to that, except in Clause 3, and that says that the meat shall be marked, but that would not apply to it.

1042. You are speaking now of the premises?—Quite so.

1043. There is nothing in the Bill, as it stands at present, that would cover that?—No.

1044. There is nothing in the schedule either, because although the Board of Agriculture will be empowered to make rules I think those rules are entirely for the marking of meat and cheese?—Yes.

1045. Then you would agree with the report of the Lords' Committee on that subject. I think the recommendation of the Lords' Committee is, that every person dealing in imported meat should be registered as such, and should fix a notice plainly exhibited over his shop that he is registered as a dealer in foreign meat?—That is what we should like.

1046. Now, would you advocate that imported meat should include meat killed at the port of disembarkation. Would you think it necessary, if a butcher dealt in meat that was slaughtered at an English port, that he should be required to be registered as selling foreign meat?—Yes, I say that. We strongly object to that. We see in Clause 15 of the Bill that all meat that is killed in any port in Great Britain or the United Kingdom is classed as English beef, which we object to. We say that it is just as much foreign as the cloth-meat is that comes to this country, and we should like Clause 15 amended if we could get it, to say that all meat killed in this country or in any port should be classed as foreign and branded as such.

1047. Therefore,

Chairman—continued.

1047. Therefore, a retail dealer, if he dealt in that, would have to be registered, and would have to put up his notice that he was a dealer in foreign meat?—Quite so.

1048. Even although he did not deal in frozen meat or chilled meat, or dead meat?—That is so. Frozen meat does not affect the British farmer as regards our district, because anyone can tell it. That does not come in competition with our best English meat; you can tell it in a moment from the best foreign meat.

1049. Is that, in your opinion, the case in the retail shops?—Yes.

1050. You say that the ordinary consumer could tell?—Yes.

1051. Do you think I could tell?—Yes, as frozen meat.

1052. I could tell by the appearance of the meat?—Yes.

1053. Do you think all classes of the community would notice the difference in the shop if they saw the two together?—There is not the slightest doubt. There is a tremendous difference between cloth-meat and English-killed meat.

1054. Is there a difference after it is cooked?—I could not say as a fact.

1055. Could you tell the difference after it was cooked?—I hope I have never had any to try. I do not think I have tried the cloth meat.

1056. Before it is cooked it is quite apparent?—Oh, yes; you see loads of it every day in Birkenhead.

1057. You think it would not be necessary to be an expert; do you think that a person who had never heard of frozen meat at all could tell the difference?—They would be able to tell that, I think.

1058. Their eye would be directed to it that there was a difference?—I think so; I am positively certain of it in my own mind.

1059. Would that be the case if the fresh meat that is English-produced and English-killed meat had been in the refrigerator; if it had been kept in a cold place?—It does not look well at all.

1060. You are speaking of frozen meat?—Yes.

1061. There is also imported chilled meat, which is not frozen?—You see, what we see of it in our district gets so knocked about with coming across, and putting on these carts and lorries, and carting about in these cloths, that it has a different appearance. It is not as bright, and so does not look as well.

1062. Even when it is cut up?—Even when it is cut up it does not look the same.

1063. Is there any perceptible difference between the meat of the foreign cattle that are killed here and the English-grown meat; is there anything perceptible in the retail shop?—I could not say there was. You could not tell it, except, perhaps, you get larger shins or larger bones from the lairage at Birkenhead or Deptford than you would with the majority of English meat.

1064. The ordinary purchaser would not see any difference in the shop?—No, I do not think he could tell the difference.

Chairman—continued.

1065. Why do you want the retailer who is retailing the meat of foreign cattle killed here to be registered?—We say that as long as the foreign meat is coming here, we, as British farmers, should like our meat to be sold as English, and we should like the foreign meat coming from abroad, imported alive here and killed, sold as foreign meat, and let the public judge what they are going to have; and we think it will benefit the farmers of England to a great degree.

1066. Do you think the foreign cattle I am referring to, not the dead meat, but the meat from foreign cattle imported alive, do you think that is inferior to the home produced?—I should not say so; I cannot say that it is; I do not say it is inferior.

1067. I am speaking of the average?—I have been in the lairage at Birkenhead very often, and I have seen the beasts there. Taking our own English-killed beef every Englishman likes it if they know it, but I do not think there is much comparison in it. I think myself it is pretty nearly the same quality as our own when it has been standing at the lairage of Birkenhead six or seven days after it has landed, so that the sea sickness and all that gets off the beast.

1068. If it is not very inferior what is the advantage of making this marked distinction between this and the other, because I presume there is a considerable difference in home-grown meat between one beast and another?—Quite so.

1069. A very marked difference?—Quite so.

1070. So that there is what you and I, an ordinary purchaser, would know as very fine meat?—Yes.

1071. And secondary meat, rather inferior meat?—Quite so.

1072. If there is not a greater difference than that between the foreign, what I will call the live dead meat, and the English, why should you make such a distinction as to make it necessary to go through all this trouble of registering and trying to protect the housekeeper who can judge herself of the quality of the meat?—When I, as a farmer, feed 50 or 60 beasts, and I get butchers to go out to my place, or I send them to a sale I get less for them, because the foreign meat from the lairage would equal them in price at Birkenhead, and we cannot grow our English meat to sell them at the price they can send them from America. The freights are so low, and they are sold and killed at Birkenhead, and we could not produce them in this country to compete against that American.

1073. Supposing the butcher who dealt in this meat from Birkenhead put up a notice on his door, do you think he would he able to get a better price for the home-grown meat from the consumer?—Yes, I do.

1074. He would get a better price for it?—I think he would.

1075. Would he not still continue to sell the foreign meat?—No; I may say I have made inquiries of two or three very large butchers or purveyors of meat, and they have told me individually that they would only be too pleased (that is in Birkenhead) to be registered and put it up over

Chairman— continued.

their shop—if they wanted to sell the foreign meat they would be registered for the sale of it, because they can deal exclusively in English or British fed cattle, Irish or Scotch, and they would get plenty of it, and they could get a better price, and they would be able to give the farmers a better price.

1076. People who put up the notice 7—No, the people who did not put up the notice.

1077. That is to say, the shops that did not register themselves could get a better price, because the public would be assured that they were getting home-bred meat?—Yes.

1078. What do you think of the argument put before us, that if there was a system of marking or registering, so that the public knew more distinctly that they were buying foreign meat, that would be an advertisement for foreign meat?—I have heard it down in our own lairages; they think it would be a very good thing, because they mean to say the American is better; but I say let them try it. As farmers we are quite prepared to meet them. We can grow more stock; we know we can get a better price for our English than they can for the American at the present time, and know we can grow and get better prices. We shall certainly be able to compete with them.

1079. You have been dealing with the registering of the shop, and putting up the notice. I want to ask you what you think of marking the meat itself?—Meat may be marked in such a way killed at the lairages. I should only brand it myself in the forequarter and the hind quarter. You could not brand it anywhere; you could not mark the meat; it would be impossible to mark all joints.

1080. You would have some system of marking the whole carcase in two places?—Yes.

1081. Does that apply to cattle as well as sheep?—Yes, certainly.

1082. Just two places?—Just two places. you could not mark the joints; it would be impossible.

1083. I understand from your previous evidence that you would not care about marking the dead meat imported, the frozen and the chilled?—They would be registered, I take it, exactly the same.

1084. The place would be registered where they were sold, but you would not care about marking the meat itself?—I do not think it would so much matter.

1085. You said it was pretty apparent what it was?—Yes, I do not think it would much matter; but still if you did one you might as well do the lot, to be on the safe side.

1086. You do not think that that is as important a matter as marking the other?—No.

1087. If you had registration and notice, and it would be an offence if a man sold foreign meat in a place where he was assumed to be selling English meat; if you got that, would you very much desire the marking. Do you think the marking would be any very great additional protection in a retail shop?—If it was marked so at the lairage, and was sent out, any person buying three or four sides, or whatever the case may be, so marked, it would then be put down in their

Chairman—continued.

book where it was sold to, and the inspector would be able to follow it up.

1088. So that it does not so much earmark the meat when it gets into the retail shop as that it is a way of following it and seeing whether it is sold in a registered shop?—Yes, in the proper manner sold as what it is.

1089. In what form is the meat sold from the lairages; is it the whole carcase?—You can go and buy the beast.

1090. I am speaking of whoever it is, whether the middleman or retail man who buys there; in what form does he buy?—Any small butcher can go down and buy a side or half a side, or a piece, or anything else.

1091. I may take it the way it is sold there is very much the same as we heard yesterday in the meat market in Smithfield, where it is sold to a butcher in any convenient size that he may desire?—I do not think they can get at Birkenhead anything less than a quarter of a side.

1092. Some butchers, I suppose, take the whole carcase?—Yes.

1093. The majority of them?—Twenty or 30 beasts, some of them, there is no doubt.

1094. Your idea is that if this registration of this notice and the branding of the meat, for what it was worth, was carried out, there would be a greater demand for British-fed beef?—Yes, I quite believe that, and that is my friend the butcher's opinion.

1095. Why is there not a greater demand for British-fed beef?—I think every bit of the beasts we kill is all sold now, and there is quite a good demand for it as far as we do kill them, but, we having to compete against this foreign meat, there is not nearly so much fed in England as there would be if there was less of the foreign meat.

1096. Is it your theory that the people who would desire to have English-grown meat are being supplied now with foreign cattle at the lairages?—Yes, as English.

1097. And if there was this mark, you think there is a demand for English beef which is now being satisfied unknown to the purchaser by foreign meat?—Quite so.

1098. They would absolutely buy the English-grown meat?—There is no doubt about it.

1099. What is the difference of price on an average between the English grown and the foreign?—The wholesale price.

1100. No, I want the retail price?—Do you mean the cloth meat, or this country-killed meat?

1101. I would rather take the lairages at Birkenhead; what difference is there between it and the home-killed and home-grown meat?—I do not think if you went into a retail shop you would get any difference. I know lots of butchers who have both English meat and foreign Birkenhead killed; some of the first-class butchers supply very big places indeed, and the question is not raised. We will say one butcher goes and buys two or there English beasts; he gets five or six more from the lairage; they are all sold together, and there is no distinction whatever. One he will get at *6d.* or *7d.* and the other at the lairage he will pay only the market value for.

Chairman—continued.

1102. What is that?—I think, to-day, it is 4*d.* or 5*d.*

1103. He buys it a penny or twopence cheaper?—Yes.

1104. You get a much better price from him?—You do, but it is all sold as the same.

1105. Do you think he would get 8*d.* or 9*d.*?—We should get a better price and should be able to kill more beasts; there is no doubt about it.

1106. Still, if he gave you 8*d.* or 9*d.* it would pay him very much better to buy the foreign meat and sell that?—Yes, but which would the public buy, supposing you call it 7½*d.* or 8*d.* a pound, for good bullocks and heifers.

1107. Do you not think the mass of the purchasers (as you say, the meat is not very different) would prefer to pay a penny or twopence less?—Perhaps a lot of the masses would, but it would create a fresh trade; it would create a trade in purely English beef.

1108. Surely, if the meat is equally good, which you have admitted, or something like it, and there is not a very great difference, the great majority of the working classes would prefer to buy the meat that is cheaper rather than that which is dearer, would they not?—Perhaps they would.

1109. And they would never go to the home-grown shop, but would go to the foreign one, and not care whether it was foreign or not so long as the meat was good enough, if they got it at a lower price?—Quite so, that may be so, but still we think it would create such a trade that we should be able to get out all our meat at a good price, and it would be sold fairly as English meat, and when it is sold solely as English meat they would get a better class trade.

1110. Have you any doubt that you would get your trade out of the better classes rather than out of the masses?—I think so.

1111. That is to say, the better class would not mind paying more if they got home-grown stuff?—If they got home-grown stuff, that is what I think.

1112. You do not think the masses would do that?—No, I do not think they would, if they could get it cheaper, and as good.

1113. They would look to the price?—Yes, I should think so.

1114. It would really be only the better classes who would be giving you the better price you want?—There are some people of the lower class who would rather have home-grown.

1115. There is no other part of the Bill you wish to say anything about. Now, about cheese. Will you give us, generally, your views as to the marking of cheese. Are your farmers in favour of that?—Yes, we should like it marked, we do not make many cheeses in the Hundred of Wirral, but I know Cheshire pretty well.

1116. Speaking generally, they are in favour of having them marked?—Yes.

1117. And for the same reasons as you have given in the case of meat?—Yes.

1118. You think if it was marked they would get a better price?—Yes.

1119. Because they would be sure of what they got?—Yes.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1120. You are so candid a witness that I do not think I shall need to trouble you long in cross-examination. You want this Bill, and you want Clause 15 altered, because you think it will raise the price of British meat?—Yes, I do.

1121. Let me ask you as to these live imports killed at Birkenhead; in your own country you have told us there is practically no difference in quality between that and your own meat?—Yes.

1122. Nor is there any difference in appearance, is there?—I think there is very little difference in appearance, except one is a little coarser than the other; but there is very little in it.

1123. If you took a beast from the lairage which has had time to recover from the effects of the voyage, and put it against one of your beasts, there would not be any difference?—No.

1124. Nine farmers out of 10 from other parts of the country would not know the difference?—It depends on which you see. You see some of the lairage beasts shod with shoes which have been worked.

1125. That is very rare?—It used not to be; I think it is rare now, but it was not some years ago.

1126. There is some good class of meat which comes here?—Yes.

1127. That is bred from British stock?—Practically, stock sent out from this country.

1128. If a man was born in America of British parents would you call him a Briton or a Yankee?—I should call him a Yankee. He pays less for his land than we have to do in this country.

1129. At any rate, an ox bred from a British sire, or British stock, would have just as much right to be called a British beast as that man would have to be called a Briton?—Perhaps so, in the way you put it.

1130. Do you know Mr. Wagstaff?—I know him by sight; he is the meat inspector at Birkenhead.

1031. You have a good deal of trouble about your meat inspection, have not you?—Yes, we have had a lot of trouble lately about that.

1132. A great many oxen have been condemned?—I do not think there have been a great many; but there have been some condemned with tuberculosis. There have not been a great many. Mr. Wagstaff is at Birkenhead. Birkenhead and Liverpool are both adjoining, and beasts that will pass in Liverpool will not pass in Birkenhead; lots of them therefore, the majority of the beasts now, are not killed at Birkenhead. If you take the Birkenhead abattoir, I am speaking of the English beasts, there is very little English killed there in comparison with what there would be.

1133. There is practically no English meat, I take it, consumed in Birkenhead now?—Oh, yes; there is no doubt there is plenty of it.

1134. It is a very small proportion, is it not?—One or two of the best butchers I know have killed their meat in Liverpool and carted it back.

1135. On account of the inspection?—On account of the inspection; and some kill out of the borough altogether—not in the Borough of Birkenhead.

1136. There is no tuberculosis among the foreign cattle?—I believe not, or very rare cases.

1137. You will admit absolutely, unreservedly, I suppose, that, as far as the consumer is concerned,

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

concerned, there will be no advantage in marking these live imports as foreign?—I should think there would, for the simple reason that if it was marked and registered, they would know then what they were buying—whether they were buying home production or from abroad.

1138. But the quality is equally good?—I think the quality is somewhere about the same.

1139. And, if anything, there is a balance in favour of the health of the foreign imports?—I do not know about that; I could not tell you exactly about that.

1140. The only advantage of passing the Bill would be that the farmer should get a better price for his meat?—It would help the British farmer, and it would help the public, because they would know what they were buying, and they do not at the present time.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1141. Do you think the views you have expressed this morning are very generally shared by the farmers throughout the country?—I think so.

1142. You do not profess to represent the opinion of farmers generally, do you?—We profess to represent the whole of the Hundred of Wirral, that is one portion of Cheshire. I know the majority of the farmers in Cheshire, and wherever I have spoken to them they are all of the same opinion.

1143. You have told us very frankly, it seems to me, from your evidence, in the first place, that for practical purposes there would be no advantage in marking the meat?—That is the cloth meat. Quite so.

1144. I understood you to say you could tell it?—You can tell it. I can tell it.

1145. You say, as far as frozen meat is concerned, anyone could tell it?—Anyone could tell it.

1146. I understood you to say the same would apply to chilled beef; that a person would be able to tell, if he went into a butcher's shop?—I do not know whether he would be able to tell the chilled meat that was refrigerated in Birkenhead in the lairage. It is a question how much it gets knocked about.

Chairman.

1147. You mean chilled dead meat?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1148. You said when it came into your district it was so much knocked about that anyone could tell it?—Yes, I know I could myself; I have very often seen it; and if you saw the shops you would form the same opinion.

1149. But the meat is already marked?—Practically, the frozen meat.

1150. It is marked now?—Practically, yes.

1151. But to any practical person it would be marked?—Yes.

1152. What advantage will there be in further marking it?—I do not speak so much of marking this frozen meat as marking the meat that is killed in this country coming from abroad. That is what I am here for to-day.

1153. Is your object in having it marked that of protecting the consumer?—Yes, protecting

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

the consumer, so that they would know what they are going to buy.

1154. You have told us just now that the consumer does know, and that anybody can tell?—That is the dead meat, not the lairage meat.

1155. You are perfectly certain the main reason why the farmers in your district desire this Bill is because they wish to protect the public; is that your view?—Protect the public in what way?

1156. Against fraud?—Yes; and also to help to raise the price of our own beasts.

1157. Is not your view rather, and that of your friends, that you want to make a better price for your beef?—We should certainly like it.

1158. That is the real object you have in view, is it not?—It is.

1159. To improve the price of the article you sell?—Yes; and also that more beasts should be fed in the country, and bred in the country too.

1160. In other words, you desire protection for your particular article?—If you like to call it protection it will be all right. I do not know what you would call it correctly.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

1161. Fair play?—Yes, fair play.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1162. You want protection for your particular article?—No; we would sell the article for what it is, and let the Americans sell theirs for what it is.

1163. You told me just now the main object you have is to increase the price of the article you sell?—Both increase the price of the article we sell and let the public know what we are doing, and we can breed more cattle in England and have more land in cultivation than is in cultivation at the present time.

1164. You have told us you desire that each person should be registered, and your object for that, as far as I can gather, is that you thought the foreign meat shop would be a distinct institution from the English meat shop?—Yes.

1165. I understood you also to say that, at the present time, there were large butchers who bought some English and some foreign meat?—There are.

1166. Do the public care whether the meat they buy is fed in England or America?—The majority of people would like to know what they are buying.

1167. Is it not more a question of price and quality?—I do not see, myself.

1168. You really think there is so much good sentiment in this country that a man would rather pay twopence a pound more for a piece fed in your district than in America?—I think so.

1169. I am asking you a plain question. Do you think so?—I think there are a lot of people who would rather pay more money for it than they would for American, if they knew they were getting the real article.

1170. Do you not think that if that were carried out it would rather cut against you in this way, that at present two-thirds of the meat consumed in this country is English meat, and only one-third is foreign meat. I think I am right in that. If you are going to drive the

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

mass of the people who you say do not care, and whose object is to get the article at the lowest price, if you are going to drive the mass of the people to the foreign shop, are you not going to injure yourself in the process?—I do not think so; it is a different trade altogether.

1171. I think if I were in your position I should object to the creation of that trade?—We do not. We should like it carried on in its own name.

1172. Do you think the masses or the classes consume the greatest quantity of meat?—The masses.

1173. If you lose the masses you would be great sufferers?—I do not think so. They only take the rough meat, they do not take the best quality.

1174. They take your rough English meat?—Part of them. We could sell the rough English meat at the same price as the other, and we should get a better price for the better joints.

1175. If you had driven the consumer to the foreign shop, where would you be then?—You have not driven him.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

1176. I have very little to ask you; I should like to ask you this question. You have no certainty of the price of fat cattle being raised if this Bill is passed. It is a mere biassed opinion of your own?—Not of my own, but of the farmers in general. We are all agreed as to that, that we should get a better price, and have more need to breed more stock in the country, and there would be a better feeling all round.

1177. How much do you think you would get it raised in the pound?—If we got it raised a farthing or a halfpenny it would make a lot of difference to the farmers of England.

1178. You would prefer taking the chance of raising the price to running the risk of the public, as Mr. Doughty said, flying to these shops and buying it at a halfpenny a pound cheaper?—Yes.

1179. You are quite prepared to face that risk?—Quite prepared. That is putting us on the same basis, and we can always compete all right, but we cannot compete against foreign competition with the land at the price we pay for it.

1180. If that did not raise the price for fat cattle one penny or a halfpenny a pound, you would be no better than you are?—We should be no worse.

1181. You would be running an enormous risk of lowering your beef a penny or twopence?—I do not see where the risk would come in.

1182. You think the public would be perfectly satisfied to pay 2*d.* a pound more?—I do not say 2*d.* a pound. Supposing we got a halfpenny a pound on it.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1183. You are a practical farmer, and have been for many years?—Yes, all my life.

1184. You think you understand your own business?—I hope so.

1185. And can give us in the House of Commons a little information on what we do not know ourselves?—I do not know about that.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

1186. One of the honourable Members asked you just now whether you represented a very large number of farmers. You represent a very considerable area of land?—Yes.

1187. And that area of land is particularly affected by the circumstances of the importation of foreign cattle at the lairage at Birkenhead?—Yes.

1188. So that if you do not speak for a very large number numerically of farmers throughout England, still, at all events, you speak for a class, and a large class, that would be very much affected by this Bill?—Yes.

1189. Are there any large sales of cattle which take place in the neighbourhood of Wirral?—Yes, we have two or three every week, and also we have three or four at Chester adjoining the Hundred of Wirral. One *half* would go there and the other half would go to Hooton sales.

1190. Can you give us any idea of the number of beasts that are put up equally at Chester and the two sales at Hooton?—It is just a question of the seasons of the year. At the Chester sales I have seen them average about 130 to 140 beasts each sale per week; that is the public sales, besides the fair. That has nothing to do with Chester Fair. Then at the sales at Hooton I have seen from 30 to 40 each sale per week.

1191. On each day?—They are there on the one day. I could give you the exact statistics.

1192. Still that shows sufficiently there is a considerable trade done?—That is where we say would be the benefit to us. The Birkenhead butchers come out to Hooton sale, and if we had English beasts sold there, they will not give us the price, because the lairage is so near. We cannot get the same price per pound that people in the country get. We have to compete against the lairage, more so than the Midland Counties.

1193. You are brought into more particular contact?—Yes.

1194. One or two members have tried to make you say that you are doing all this in the interests of the farmers. You want the meat marked in the interest of the farmer; but as a matter of fact, I take it that the consumer would benefit by it also?—There is no doubt of it.

1195. You told the Chairman, I think, that a butcher bought meat at 6½*d.* or so much from you, while, perhaps, he gave only 6¼*d.* in the lairage?—Quite so.

1196. Then he sells that meat, both the lairage meat and your meat, at the same price?—Exactly the same.

1197. He has to sell at a price that would pay him on the 2*d.*, at all events?—Yes.

1198. Surely, under those circumstances, he must be charging the consumer a higher price than if the consumer knew that he was buying foreign meat, and would only give the market price for that foreign meat?—Quite so, that is what we contend. If it was marked the consumers would know what they were buying.

1199. So that in that respect we are dealing by this Bill quite as much in the interests of the consumer as in the interests of the home producer?—We think so. I do think so.

1200. The

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

1200. The cry of protection has been raised, but you must not be alarmed by the use of the word. I suppose protection, in your opinion, is all nonsense and absurd?—Yes.

1201. You have no wish to protect yourselves unduly against the interest of any other class?—Certainly not, give us a fair chance, that is all we ask.

1202. The only thing you are asking for is, that it should be fair play all round?—Yes, that is so.

1203. And that you should be placed on the same terms as those with whom you are in competition?—That is so, then I think we shall win; in fact, I am sure of it.

Mr. *Hozier.*

1204. As far as protection goes, you merely wish to be protected against fraud? — That is all.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1205. One question about cheese. You said that you supported the Bill, on account of cheese, for the same reasons as you did with regard to meat?—Yes, marking them the same.

1206. And for the same reasons?—Practically so.

1207. Might there not be this difference: we are all pretty much agreed that between meat imported from abroad and killed in this country and home-grown meat, there is not much difference?—Yes.

1208. Would you, as a Cheshire man, say the same with respect to cheese?—As a Cheshire man I have been making cheese for many years, or my people have, and as a Cheshire man I say the same thing would apply there. You get good American and bad American, and the good American classes with our native stuff, and is very likely in many shops sold as such.

1209. Good Cheshire is supposed, at all events, always to command, and does really get a higher price than good American would?—It ought to do, but then you see the good American is made on the same principle now as the Cheshire, practically.

1210. Do you think that the amount of good cheese that is imported from America now is as much in comparison to our own output now as it was 15 years ago?—I do not think they are sending quite as much as they did, according to the statistics I was looking at the other day. I do not think we are getting as much from abroad quite, if that is what you mean.

1211. In proportion?—In proportion. I think there is more cheese made in Cheshire to-day than there was 15 years ago.

1212. Do you know that the quality of American cheese has risen also, as well as Cheshire?—Yes, to a certain degree it has.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

1213. I understand you are a farmer, and not a butcher?—Yes.

1214. You are conversant with the market?—Yes, we are close to the market.

1215. And you have had every opportunity of knowing what the demand is for the various

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

classes of meat; you come here as an expert?—I do not think I have come as an expert; I have come down to represent my brother farmers, and get you gentlemen to put a clause in this Bill that will protect us and the public as well.

1216. I want to ask you if you have a sufficient experience of the meat market to be able to tell me what the demand is for different classes of meat?—I do not think I have; not as to the meat market. I should not say so.

1217. When you say that in your opinion there is an appreciable class of consumers who are willing to pay a higher price for English-fed meat than for foreign meat, what do you base that opinion upon?—I think that the general public would pay a higher price.

1218. I did not understand you to say the general public, but what I understood you to mean was that there was a certain class of consumer and an appreciable class of consumer who would pay higher prices for you?—Take the better class of people; we all think that the better class of people would give a higher price if they knew it was English-fed meat and fed in this country, than they would if they thought they were getting foreign.

1219. You tell me you think that?—Yes.

1220. I want to help you, and I want you to help me by telling me what you found that opinion upon?—We found the opinion in our club on that.

1221. It is simply the opinion of your club?—Simply the opinion of our club and the farmers in the district.

1222. It is not supported at the present time by any outside demand?—I do not think so.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

1223. You are in favour of having the meat slaughtered at Liverpool branded when it is dead?—Yes.

1224. You said it would be an easy matter to tell the difference between frozen meat and the home-fed meat in the butcher's shop?—The frozen meat killed abroad or brought here, or the foreign meat killed here and taken straight to the shops. There is a marked difference there is no doubt, but it would not come under the same heading, because the best butchers would not have the frozen meat in their shops.

1225. Suppose a child is sent out for a pound or two of steak, or a chop, or say, an inexperienced girl, would she be able to detect it?—I suppose the master or mistress would send them to a certain shop where they would know; if it was a first-class butcher's they would not trade in frozen meat.

1226. Is it your opinion that a child (without regard to a particular shop) would be able to detect it?—I do not think a child would be able to detect it.

1227. Is the difference so marked that a child or an inexperienced servant girl would be able to detect it?—I should think not. I do not think it is so marked. They would not take the trouble to see whether it was marked or not.

1228. Then it would require an expert like yourself to be to able to detect it?—Quite so.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

1229. You said just now about the cheese, that you thought American cheese was so much improved that you did not know that much good would be done by branding Cheshire cheese; did I understand you to say that?—Certainly not. I do not say American is so much improved; I said to Colonel Cotton Jodrell that they were improved very much from what they were 15 years ago, and so was Cheshire improved in quality.

1230. You think American cheese is largely improved in the last 15 years?—Slightly.

1231. Do you speak of any particular kind of American cheese or of American cheese as a whole?—Yes.

1232. Have you read the evidence given before a Committee of the House of Commons last year or the year before, in which the matter of this American cheese came in, and where it was given in evidence that a large quantity of the American cheese that comes from America is known as "filled cheese"?—Yes.

1233. Do you know what filled cheese is?—Yes.

1234. That is altogether an American product?—Yes.

1235. And that is a fraud on the public?—Yes.

1236. Is this fraudulent filled cheese largely of the kind that competes with you?—I have never seen it compete with us. I am speaking of the better kind that competes with Cheshire. I do not think that "filled cheese" would come under the same heading at all.

1237. Are you aware that a great deal of American cheese is "filled cheese"?—I was not aware of it.

1238. You are in favour of having dealers in foreign meat having a notice over their door that they are dealing in foreign meat?—Yes.

1239. That is not so much in the interests of the farmers as in the interests of the public?—Yes.

1240. You think the public should have a chance of knowing what they get?—Yes.

1241. Which at present they do not?—Yes.

1242. You gave an instance of a butcher in your own district who sold five beasts, two of which he bought from local farmers, and three from the lairage?—I do not say one instance; I say that may be the proportion.

1243. These were sold at the same price to the public?—Yes.

1244. Did you ever know any butcher who sold both British and foreign meat tell the public when they came into his shop, "Mr. So-and-so, that is foreign; that is American meat"?—I believe if I went in myself and asked any of the butchers in our district, that did deal in the two, which was foreign, he would tell me.

1245. I have no doubt that would be so, but that is not the question. Did you ever know one anxious to do trade, and to increase his business, tell the public, going into his shop, "That is foreign meat"?—Certainly not.

1246. Why does he not do that?—It would be against his interest to do so.

1247. To let the public know he was selling foreign meat?—Certainly, there is no doubt about it.

1248. That is the reason he does not do it?—Quite so.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

1249. Because he is a wise man?—Yes, in his own estimation.

1250. And the reason he does not do it is because he knows himself that the foreign meat is not as good as the home meat?—He knows the general public think so.

1251. Your idea is that if these shops were registered, and the notice up, that the general public would shun these shops in a desire to go where the British meat is sold?—The better class would do so; there is no doubt about it.

1252. You do not disagree with the evidence given before this Committee that at the present day, with all classes, it is a question of price, and not of quality?—I believe the masses will not go and pay big prices, but there is a certain class of people in this country who, I believe, would go and pay more money if they knew they were getting proper English meat.

1253. You disagree with the evidence given by a gentleman here, who said to us that with all classes, making no exception whatever, it is now a question of price and not of quality?—Certainly not; I disagree with whoever said that; I do not know who it was.

1254. I think in reply to Sir Elliott Lees you said there was not much, or any, tuberculosis in foreign cattle?—I believe very little.

1255. Do you know that the House of Commons last year passed a Bill to exclude Canadian cattle from the country?—Quite so; but they were foreign cattle that came to Birkenhead, that is States cattle.

1256. You do not think you get unhealthy States cattle?—No.

1257. If the Agricultural Board believed there was no danger to the health of the people of the country why would they keep out Canadian store cattle or States store cattle?—Quite so; they thought there was a reason, and that is the reason they stopped it. There was a case with the Canadian cattle found, but the Canadian cattle was not killed at the lairage; it went all over England; but these are cattle killed at that point.

1258. The question you were asked was an insidious question, if I might be allowed to say so, as to the health of these foreign cattle. These foreign cattle cannot be as healthy as people imagine, otherwise the Government would not have passed the Bill last year to prevent Canadian and States cattle coming in?—Quite so.

1259. You are perfectly prepared, and all your friends, the farmers, are prepared to take any risk consequent on marking the foreign meat, or consequent on the registration of dealers in foreign cattle?—We are.

1260. You believe that if you get a fair chance for your home product you would get a better price?—Yes.

1261. And the public will be more fairly dealt with?—I am certain they would, and they would have a better article.

1262. You told us there was such a great difference between frozen meat and British-killed meat that an ordinary person would be able to detect it in that shape. Did you include in frozen meat, chilled meat?—I did not; I meant

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

meant the cloth meat that comes from abroad which is frozen, put into the refrigerators and sent across here, sheep and all that. The dead meat that was delivered in Liverpool every week.

1263. You are speaking more of meat that comes from Argentina, or New Zealand, or Australia?—That is so.

1264. Do you think it would be so easy for the ordinary individual to detect chilled meat in a shop from home-killed meat?—The chilled meat, I take it, is chilled here in this country?

1265. Some of it comes from America in the refrigerator?—That will be cloth meat, exactly the same if it is chilled. They will have cloths on it.

1266. Why is it?—And it is a different colour. It is not the same class of meat altogether; you would see the difference directly. I do not say any novice (as the honourable gentleman asked me as regards a servant girl or a child) would be able to tell, but any common-sense individual could tell the difference between cloth meat and English meat.

1267. Do you think that any cattle, after a long voyage and suffering from sea-sickness and the hardships incidental to travel, and which is killed on arrival, would make as good meat or as nutritious meat as home-killed meat?—No, they do not.

1268. You think these foreign cattle, in order to be as nutritious or make as good food, ought to be kept here a fortnight after they have arrived?—Yes.

1269. As a matter of fact, they are very often killed immediately?—Yes, very often killed the day they arrive.

1270. These cattle are very often suffering from fever?—I have seen them myself down in the lairage when they could not get up.

1271. In that condition they would not be as good food?—They would not; there is not the slightest doubt about it.

1272. There is not the slightest doubt that they could not be as good food, is there?—We do not think so.

1273. The only other question I will ask you is this: what kind of meat do you use yourself; is it English or foreign?—English, if I can get it. Sometimes I get some foreign, but they mostly send me word.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1274. You would not object to Irish meat?—No, Irish meat is all right. I often buy it myself.

1275. I understand what you wish is, that there should be free and open competition in the market here between foreign meat and British meat?—Yes.

1276. And that foreign meat should be marked in some way or other, so that the general public if they wish it should have no doubt as to what they are buying?—That is so.

1277. And you believe that the good sense of the British public would be in favour of the home-fed meat?—Quite so.

1278. And that in that way the demand for home-fed meat would be increased?—That is so.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

1279. By the passing of some such Bill as this?—That is so.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

1280. Have you been speaking about beef altogether or about mutton also?—I think beef altogether, but you can class mutton, if you like, with it. That would be affected in the same way exactly.

1281. The question of mutton has not come before you so much?—We have a lot of Canadian sheep killed at the lairage, there is not the slightest doubt about it, and that goes against our home-fed sheep, exactly in the same way. I remember selling some sheep to a butcher last year, and he said, these sheep have to be classed exactly as the Canadian are, we can buy Canadian at so much a pound, and these will be classed at the same price.

1282. Are these brought here alive and then killed, or are they brought in frozen?—They are brought here alive and killed here.

1283. In regard to the beef, you wish to extend this Bill to the beef of animals that come here and are killed?—Are killed here.

1284. Have you been to the lairage yourself?—Yes, many a time.

1285. Have you seen them frequently?—Do you mean the bad ones particularly, or all of them.

1286. Have you seen the beasts frequently?—Yes, I have often seen them; we live close to it.

1287. Do you often see them coming off sea-sick?—Yes. You can see that yourself crossing over by the Woodside Ferry to Liverpool.

1288. And you have seen them coming off well?—Yes, lots of them come off all right; some will eat when they land and some will not, according to the passage they have had; some have had a rough passage.

1289. Take the beasts which are landed well or beasts which are kept for a week and killed; can you tell the beef of those beasts from the beef of an English beast?—I think there is very little, as I said before, material difference in regard to the public. I believe I said if it has been landed, and allowed to stand for a week or a fortnight, and then killed in the natural manner, if it has got over its sea-sickness or anything of the kind.

1290. Suppose it was killed in that way, and then suppose you went into a butcher's shop in the country and took a joint of beef, could you tell by looking at it whether it was a beast that had come across from Canada, or whether it was English?—I do not think you could; except you might tell it by its being a little larger in the bone.

1291. Then there would be a difficulty in applying the Bill to a case of that kind?—I do not think there would be any difficulty.

1292. In the meat market the thing is sold, and everybody knows it; but take a butcher's shop in the country, how would you tell whether the Act was being obeyed or not?—I take it the Act says that every local authority must provide an inspector, which I agree with, and if there was an inspector in our district, he could go to the lairage, and he would know by the books there who was buying the meat, and he would then only

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

have to go to the shop and see whether that man was registered for the sale of foreign meat or not.

1293. Assume the man was registered for the sale of foreign meat, could he tell whether the particular beef he sold was English?—He would not want to know that, if he sells a particular class of stuff.

Chairman.

1294. The question is, what is to prevent that man who sells that meat selling that for English meat? He would not be committing an offence in selling foreign meat if he was registered.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

1295. A man who is registered to sell foreign meat would be allowed to sell English meat. He would not be forbidden?—Certainly.

1296. My difficulty is this. If he had got over the door his name as registered to sell foreign meat, and he had a joint of beef on his table, what is to prevent him selling that as English beef though it is American, and at the English price. How would you detect it?—I do not see how you could detect that.

1297. Then with regard to frozen meat, meat that has been frozen, you can always tell that from meat that has not been frozen?—Practically you can.

1298. Is there not a good deal of beef that comes over not frozen through; just chilled?—I was not aware of that before to-day; not the chilled meat.

1299. Is it not the case that a good many butchers here have refrigerating rooms now, and keep sides of beef in those rooms in the summer for a fortnight or more?—I do not think they can keep them as long as that. Two or three butchers have little refrigerating rooms, as you call them, that they put a few legs of mutton in and half a side of beef in and keep it there, but they will not keep it any length of time.

1300. My information is that they do?—I do not believe they do.

1301. None of these that you are acquainted with do?—No, I am sure they do not.

1302. You say what you want is to have foreign beef sold as such and British beef sold as such?—Quite so.

1303. You think there would be considerable difference in price?—I do not say there would be a great difference.

1304. What margin do you think there would be?—Put it at a farthing or a halfpenny; that would make a wonderful difference; raise the English meat a farthing or a halfpenny a pound.

1305. Do you expect there would be still a farthing or a halfpenny per pound difference between the price of the English beef and the price of the American beef?—And the price of the English-killed American beef, yes. I should think about that. That is about the price it is sold at now in comparison with our own.

1306. The whole difference is just from a farthing to a halfpenny?—It will vary; sometimes the price will vary 1½*d.*

1307. 1½*d.* is the outside difference?—I should think so.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

1308. For the prime cuts?—I should think about that; I am speaking of the carcase. You buy a carcase at the lairage; that is 5*d.* You will sell your English at 6*d.* or 6½*d.*, according to the quality.

1309. Then you would expect the retail difference to be the same?—Something about the same. The retail difference would not be quite so much, because your rough cuts would not sell at as much as your choice cuts would sell at.

1310. If, for the wholesale price, you get a difference of say a halfpenny in the pound, would you not, when you get a single joint, get a good deal more difference?—As I said before, that would be as regards the quality of the beef and the quality of the goods. Some parts of the beast are worth a lot more money than others.

1311. Take similar cuts?—Taking a similar cut of American killed in this country and the English, I should think you ought to get a difference of least a penny in the pound for the English over the American.

1312. Your idea of what would be fair at a big shop, where meat was sold avowedly as American, and the meat was sold avowedly as British, is that you would expect similar cuts to give a difference of about a penny?—About a penny a pound.

1313. That agrees very closely with the prices that I have got here from a big store in London where they are sold?—Yes, that is what I should think; about that.

1314. Of course, there is a good deal of beef sold as Scotch, that is not Scotch?—Yes, I think so.

1315. There is pretty much the same difficulty there?—The same difficulty applies. There is lots of cattle comes to Birkenhead; I have seen them myself, and they are similar to our polled Anguses, but they are not Scotch. I believe they are sold as Scotch.

1316. I happen to be a Scotchman, and I could complain a great deal of English beef that is sold as Scotch, and there is a lot of mutton sold as Welsh mutton which has never been in Wales?—Yes, you can put it in that way.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

1317. The members of your club are practically unanimous in favour of the principle of marking beef?—There is no doubt about it.

1318. Do I understand you to be of opinion that, given a fair passage, there is not much difference in nutritive power between the best imported American beef and the English beef?—I should say myself there is not a great difference when it comes properly landed here. Nobody could tell the difference if they had two similar joints put together on the table. Some people say they can, but, my own opinion is, that they could not.

1319. You do not agree with the evidence given by Mr. Cooper yesterday, who maintained that imported live meat after a long journey could not compare in point of quality with the meat of the Aberdeen stockowners?—I should say if it was landed there, and left a fortnight at Birkenhead, which no doubt you gentlemen know sometimes it is left, when it is not wanted at once. If it is wanted and killed at once, I

say

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

say it would not be as good as Aberdeen; but if it is left there there would be very little difference, and I doubt whether the gentleman would be able to tell the difference himself if the two joints were put together.

1320. As far as I can understand, the great mass of it is killed at once?—There is no doubt about that.

1321. One of the Committee tried to extract from you that you wanted protection. I gather you want no protection that is not given to the foreigner?—Certainly not. All we want is fair play.

1322. That English shall be sold as English?—Quite so; we want fair play.

1323. Do you object to a sort of fraudulent protection being given to the foreigner, one may call it a fraudulent protection from the way it is sold by the retail dealer in many cases as English?—At the present time, precisely.

1324. You are also of opinion that the very fact, as is universally admitted, that a great quantity of foreign meat is sold as English, proves that if that meat was marked, a decided preference would be shown for English meat, and that therefore the retail buyer should be enabled to show that preference if he wishes to exercise it of his own free will?—Quite so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1325. With reference to that last point, you are probably more acquainted with Liverpool and Birkenhead than you are with London?—Yes, there is no doubt about that.

1326. I wonder if you have ever seen, as I have seen, in the small shops in London—have you ever seen in the small shops in Liverpool or Birkenhead, which are not probably patronised by degenerate noblemen, small joints hung up marked "English meat"?—I cannot say I have; not in Liverpool.

1327. If you asked about them, you would also see that they are of a higher price than that which is not marked; with regard to the marking I take it your club is in favour of marking?—Yes, there is no doubt about it.

1328. And, in fact, your club is in favour of what I call straightforward trade?—Yes, that is what we want.

1329. With regard to price, I think I understood you, in reply to some questions that were asked, to give it as your opinion that there was no difference, or not much difference, in price between foreign meat and English meat. I suppose you meant in the retail trade. There was not much difference between the price of English meat and the price of foreign meat?—That is wholesale; that is from the lairage.

1330. We know quite well what the difference is wholesale. Here are the totals. I mean by retail trade when a butcher sells to his consumer for his table, and by wholesale, the people who sell to the butchers' shops?—You mean to say the butcher when he sells a piece of meat. There is no difference at all in the price between foreign and English. He charges the same price.

1331. What is the reason why there is no difference in the price of meat which is sold by the butcher as English and foreign?—I suppose the public do not know.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

1332. Practically it is all sold as English?—Yes.

1333. That is your reason why there is no difference in price?—Yes.

1334. Then, in reply to some questions which were put to you, you rather thought people would not always ask, and that they generally go for the cheapest article, and that is said so in the case of the masses. Is it your experience, or have you any experience on that point, that, in regard to another article of consumption which is generally used, especially by the poor, that they always go for cheapness; I mean with regard to tea?—I do not know much about tea.

1335. Is it your opinion that poor people are those who generally buy the cheapest tea?—I should think it was.

1336. Then, from the consumers' point of view, we know the difference between the prices of meat; I believe this refers to dead meat, marked wholesale at ports, where beef is 4*d.* to 4½*d.* in carcase, and the price that the farmer probably gets is about 6*d.* to 6½*d.* in carcase; from the consumers' point of view, if they went for getting cheap meat, the butchers, I suppose, if there are any who now sell foreign as English, can make over that bargain cent. per cent. in comparison with what they can buy from the English farmer?—Quite so.

1337. I take it, what you want as farmers is not actually protection, so to speak, spelt with a big "P," but you want protection from the fraudulent competition of this foreign meat, which is sold as English at the same price as English?—Quite so.

1338. With regard to cheese, did I understand you that good American cheese is as good as English cheese?—I do not think so; not as good.

1339. It may not have been your experience but it has been mine, to send for some Cheddar cheese from a grocer's shop and get supplied with a stuff which was American and which probably cost about half the amount of money of that produced in this country. Therefore, in regard to the interests of the consumer generally you would like to see cheeses marked, too?—Exactly the same.

1340. It is not your opinion, is it, that the farmer is asking for anything unreasonable when he asks that he should be paid a fair price for his produce?—No; we think he is perfectly right.

1341. There is just one other question I want to ask you. Some questions were put to you with regard to the idea that the foreign trade might be increased by marking foreign meat, and foreign dealers in foreign meat having to register as such?—Yes.

1342. You are quite prepared to stand the risk of that, are you not—Quite so.

1343. Did you ever know a butcher who, in order to increase his trade, advertised that he dealt in foreign meat?—I do not think so; I do not think they ever would in England.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

1344. It is not your opinion that they would do so?—No.

1345. It is not your opinion that it would increase his trade?—No; I do not think so.

Mr. *Brigg.*

1346. From your near proximity to this Birkenhead market you complain that butchers can easily go there and supply themselves with meat?—Yes, quite so.

1347. Is it your opinion that your district, the Wirral district, is a district which suffers more severely from this foreign produce than any other district in the country?—We, being a little closer, may get a shade more suffering, but I do not know but what it applies to the whole of England. I believe wherever you get as close to a foreign market as ourselves, the same remark applies. We suffer a little more in regard to both beef and hay.

1348. There are only Birkenhead and Deptford that do compete?—Quite so; we do get a little more suffering.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1349. I understood it was your opinion that it handicapped you in breeding?—There is no doubt of it.

1350. And that is owing to your proximity to the source of supply?—There is no doubt if our English meat was more in demand, which we are certain it would be, we should breed far more cattle, and, no doubt, feed more on purpose to keep up that supply.

Mr. *Hozier.*

1351. You object very strongly to the part of Clause 15 which describes British and Irish meat?—Yes, that is the part.

Chairman.

1352. I should like to get one fact from you; where does the largest quantity of foreign cheese come from which competes with English cheese; what country does it come from?—I should think America is the place that the largest supply comes from.

1353. Are you aware, or is it a fact within your knowledge, that some of our largest makers in this country have been taught by people from America, and have improved their cheese?—I was not aware of that.

1354. You are not aware that in Ayrshire for some years there has been an American who has been going round to the farmers and teaching them to make cheese on an improved principle, and that it has improved the cheese?—I was not aware of that.

1355. Are you aware that a good deal of English and Scotch cheese goes to America?—I was not aware of it.

1356. You do not think much Cheshire cheese goes?—I should not think any went; I think they always supply themselves.

1357. There is one important point I want to refer to. If you had registration, and a notice was put up that a man sold foreign meat, you told us that there are a good many butchers who sell both English grown meat and foreign meat?—Quite so.

Chairman—continued.

1358. Would not this Bill, to be effectual, have to go further than it does, because it appears that a great number of butchers, perhaps all butchers, with slight exceptions, would immediately register to sell foreign meat; and assuming that they did so, or any number of them did, there would be no protection whatever to the purchaser that he did not sell foreign meat at the English meat price, and as English meat?—The butchers I have spoken to (and they are a large number, as I have said before) would not sell any foreign meat.

1359. You cannot appreciate that that might be the case?—I cannot.

1360. And therefore that in those cases the Bill as it stands, would fail?—There is no doubt about it, if they all registered.

1361. I want to make a suggestion to ascertain whether you see any objection to it, because it appears to me it might possibly meet that point. In addition to being registered and compelled to put up a notice, suppose they were also compelled either to sell the foreign meat in a separate shop quite apart from the English meat, or in a separate compartment of the shop, distinctly marked as foreign meat, and if you like, on the other side that there was English meat. In that way, as you see, the purchaser would know which was the foreign meat department, and which was the English department?—Quite so.

1362. And the purchaser would choose which department he went to, and in that case, there would be a fair security under the law that he would get what he asked for, and what he wanted?—Yes.

1363. Do you think there would be any objection or difficulty to the retail butcher in carrying that out?—Do you suggest that you will have a shop partitioned off?

1364. I do not suggest that; but, of course, in different shops it could be done in different ways, which would be sufficient for my purpose. If one side of the shop had "foreign meat" over it, and the other side "English meat," that would be clear?—Quite so.

1365. If it was a smaller shop, the further end of the counter might have "foreign meat," and the other end "English meat"?—Yes, I should not think there would be any objection to it, and it could be carried out.

1366. Then even in the smaller shop they would not be mixed?—That is more than we are asking for.

1367. Would not that, in your opinion, be a practical way of getting what is wanted rather than all this suggestion of marking, which, as I understand you, would not meet the case when it was cut up into small pieces?—You would have to have it marked at the same time, because they would shift it from one side to the other; you could not tell at all.

1368. The point would be this: that although, of course, they could do that, it would be an offence?—It would be an offence.

1369. And you would be the inspector, seeing that the law was carried out, and, even, if every case was not discovered by the inspector, do you not believe it would be a deterrent?—Very probably it would.

1370. Again,

Chairman—continued.

1370. Again, knowing that it would be fraudulent, would they not be afraid of being caught?—Yes, it would take a long time to do that. Your inspector would be one for a district, and he would be all over the place. He could not be at one shop all the time.

1371. You have distinctly, in answer to one of the members of the Committee, said that it is possible under the Bill for this still to take place; that a man who has registered himself as selling foreign meat may sell it as English meat, and you do not see your way to meet that?—No; it might be done.

1372. I have made a suggestion to meet that?—It might be done.

1373. At the same time you said that hardly any butcher would ever register himself in that way?—I do not think there would be. There would be very few butchers that were selling to first-class houses who would have over their shop that they were selling foreign meat.

1374. The wholesale butchers would remain as they are?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

1375. He would register himself that he might sell foreign as English meat?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1376. Do I understand you that all persons selling foreign cheese should be registered as well?—I think if a cheese has been branded, you can tell a cheese when you brand it on the rind far better than you can anything else. I do not think you want to register.

1377. You do not think it is necessary for grocers to be registered?—No.

Chairman.

1378. The Bill only compels registration in the case of meat?—That is all, I think.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1379. The marks on cheese would be too distinctive?—Certainly, on the rind of the cheese.

1380. There is not the same necessity for registration?—No.

Mr. GEORGE TERRETT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1381. YOU are Chief Inspector of the Central Meat Market at Smithfield?—My correct designation is senior inspector.

1382. You are inspector under the Corporation?—The Commissioners of Sewers for the City of London.

1383. You have officers under you?—I have.

1384. Acting under the direction of the medical officer of health?—Yes, under my personal superintendence.

1385. Your duty, I suppose, is to see that the meat that is sold is fit for food?—Is fit for human food.

1386. That is your only duty, is it?—That is all, except with respect to the slaughter-houses. We have to see that the bye-laws as to slaughter-houses are observed.

1387. As far as the meat market is concerned, it is only to see that the meat that is exposed and sold is fit for human food?—That is so.

1388. You have read this Bill?—I have.

1389. Have you anything to do with cheese?—We have some little. There is a good deal of cheese sold in the Central Market, and there is a good deal of cheese changes hands at some of the warehouses in the City that comes under our supervision.

1390. Are you in favour of having foreign cheese marked?—I do not know any point that would be gained by it. Of late years foreign manufacturers of cheese have so much adopted English styles, and the English have in some respects also adopted the foreign styles, that there is very little to choose between them.

1391. Not very much to choose in quality between the one and the other on an average?—Very little indeed.

1392. Do you see any difficulty in having the cheeses marked when they are imported?—No.

Chairman—continued.

1393. Or before they are imported?—I see no difficulty in the matter.

1394. And marked in such a way that when they are sold at retail amd cut in pieces the mark would be observable?—If there is any mark it should be effectual.

1395. I come now to the meat. Of course you do not know what rules the Board of Agriculture might make under this Bill, and therefore you do not know exactly what sort of marking would be imposed if this Bill passed?—No; we are considering a subject on which we are imperfectly informed.

1396. Supposing we take the system which we hear was in operation in Belgium, that a carcase of beef was marked with three marks on one side and three on the other, six marks altogether, and in the case of sheep four, two on each side, do you think that that would be practicable?—No; I do not think it would, because I do not see what information would be afforded to the public when these carcases were cut into joints.

1397. You mean the purchaser from the retail man would have no more information than he has at present?—Very little.

1398. Unless he happened to have the joint on which the mark was?—That is so.

1399. I understand that the meat is distributed from the central market, not in carcase only, but in large pieces?—Yes; it is partly cut up.

1400. What have you to say about Section 15. I will just allow you in your own words to state it. Section 15 makes what we have called lairage cattle, that is cattle killed at the port, British and Irish meat. What is your opinion of the relative goodness of that meat compared with dead meat that is brought in?—So far as regards beef only, the beef which is imported from America in refrigerating chambers must be superior to that which has been subjected to the vicissitudes

Chairman—continued.

vicissitudes of an ocean voyage, and possibly after a very long travel to the seaboard. Frequently, I think, these beasts come some hundreds of miles before they are shipped at all.

1401. Do you include frozen meat in that?—No, I am speaking of American refrigerated beef.

1402. We will exclude frozen meat for the moment, but the meat killed on the other side and brought in cool chambers, you think, on the whole, will be superior to the cattle brought over and killed at the ports?—That is my opinion.

1403. Just give us, shortly, what your ground for that is?—Cattle which are slaughtered on the other side are rested at the place where they are slaughtered, and every care is taken that they shall be slaughtered and shipped with the meat in the best possible condition. I think that a long journey to the seaboard, and the various difficulties that may attend an ocean voyage of some days' duration, is bound to have a prejudicial effect upon the cattle if they are slaughtered close to the point of landing, as all of them are.

1404. Is it a fact that they have to be killed within a certain time of their being landed at the port?—I believe within 10 days.

1405. Are you sure it is 10 days?—I am not sure, but I believe it is 10 days.

1406. At any rate, there is a little time?—Yes.

1407. Do you give that opinion from your practical observation of the two classes of meat?—I do.

1408. And you think from your own practical observation that the dead meat is better for food than the other meat?—I certainly do.

1409. If that is the case the Bill rather proceeds upon an opposite presumption?—Yes, I see that the presumption is the reverse of that.

1410. Therefore you do not think that the foreign meat killed should be allowed to enter and be called British if the other is to be marked and called foreign; is that so?—I think if you are to mark anything at all, that which is imported alive should also be marked.

1411. Are you in favour of making a distinction between foreign meat and English?—I see little or no reason why. I see no advantage to be gained by it; I believe the difficulties in the way of marking will be found to be almost insurmountable.

1412. From an inspector's point of view, do you consider that the foreign meat on the whole is quite as good as the English meat?—I can hardly go as far as that. There are very great differences of quality in respect both to foreign and English meat, and no doubt the best kinds of foreign imported meat, are superior to the third or fourth class English meat.

1413. At any rate, from the point of view of human food, you do not think there is any necessity to make that distinction?—No.

1414. Can you give any opinion as to whether it would be an advantage to the agriculturists of the country to mark, or do you not care to go into that?—I think if you are going to pass

Chairman—continued.

Clause 15 in the form in which it is that it will be the heaviest blow you could possibly deal at the agriculturists, for this reason, that there are a great number of cattle imported alive which are in a very poor condition and yet not unfit for food, and if those are to be classed as British you would be dealing a very serious blow to the agriculturist.

1415. Do you think foreign meat is preferred by the mass of the people, taking into consideration price and quality?—I think the price is a very great inducement to a great number of the lower classes to buy American meat.

1416. There is some provision in the Bill, I think, for the inspectors to take samples of everything?—Yes.

1417. Do you think that would enable them to perform the duties which would be put upon them under the Bill?—No, I cannot see any reason why they should take samples. I think the opinions they would form upon small pieces of meat would, in the majority of instances, be unreliable.

1418. Do you think they could carry out the duties that are imposed upon them in any other way than by going through the shop and looking at the larger pieces?—Any opinion they form as to whether it is British or foreign meat should be formed by examination of the bulk.

1419. Do you think the inspectors would be able to do it?—I have seen a great deal of meat that no one could possibly tell whether it was the flesh of animals imported alive and slaughtered here, or whether it was English-grown meat.

1420. Just to take it in three ways, do you think they could tell the difference between frozen meat and fresh meat?—I think they could if a man knew his business well.

1421. Is it quite easy; do you think the purchasers can easily tell by looking at it?—The majority of them can.

1422. Now we come to refrigerated meat like the American meat; not frozen, but refrigerated. Can the expert tell the difference also between that and the English meat?—There is a little difficulty arises there, because it is frequently the case that home-grown meat is kept in a refrigerator some length of time, and especially is it the case with the carcases of animals which are slaughtered at the foreign meat landing-places at Birkenhead and Deptford. Sometimes the flesh of those animals has to be kept in the refrigerator for several days before it can be put on the market, before the market suits it.

1423. Then it becomes almost identical with that which was refrigerated after being killed on the other side?—Yes, the difficulty of telling the difference between the two then would be very great.

1424. And taking the meat of the cattle killed at Deptford and not refrigerated at all, could you tell that from the dead meat which has been refrigerated?—Oh yes, you could tell; if it had been in the refrigerator, you would be able to determine that fact.

1425. I was rather putting it that the meat killed at Deptford had not been put in the refrigerator, but put on the market at once;

would

Chairman—continued.

would there be a difference between that and the refrigerated meat?—Certainly there would. The refrigeration has a tendency to discolour the fat and lean of the meat, there is very little difficulty in telling.

1426. Even the slightest refrigeration that is found useful will show?—So much depends on what the refrigeration is. Up to now we have not been able to get absolutely dry air in the refrigerator, and if the air is damp and the atmospheric conditions are bad, the appearance of the meat changes more rapidly than if the conditions are favourable.

1427. It is not the cold that affects it so much as the damp that is at present inseparable from refrigeration?—Yes, the damp is the principal factor.

1428. Have you any opinion, if this Bill became law, whether the consumption of foreign-killed meat would increase, or decrease?—I am assuming that Clause 15 has passed. In that case, I think it would be found that the consumption of the better classes of foreign-killed meat would largely increase, because I think there would be so much meat sold as British, and found to be inferior, that purchasers would be forced to try what the other was.

1429. Forced to try the dead meat?—Forced to try the dead meat, and that they would frequently find that so satisfactory that they would not go back afterwards to the other.

1430. You think, if Clause 15 was left in, it would rather induce people gradually to go largely on foreign meat rather than on home-grown meat?—That is on the better class of foreign meat. With the inferior classes it may be said to be purely a question of price.

1431. You have an opinion, have you not, that the introduction of foreign and colonial meat at low prices has had the effect of raising the standard of quality in the better class of meat sold in this country?—It has had the effect of raising the standard of quality in the very lowest class of meat. Formerly, we used to have at the central market a great number of old cows, ewes which had got into trouble in lambing, and animals of various kinds which could not be fattened. They were exceedingly difficult things to deal with, because there was nothing about them by which the inspectors could condemn them, and yet they possessed scarcely any nutritive properties. We have found that that class of meat has almost entirely disappeared from the London markets since the introduction of low-priced colonial meat.

1432. So that, on the whole, you would say that the introduction of foreign and colonial meat has improved the quality of the meat supply of this country, is that so?—It has been a factor with others, no doubt.

1433. Are there any other reasons why this inferior meat that you describe is not so much sold now beyond that?—For one thing the inspection is very much closer than it was a few years ago.

1434. Is there less of diseased meat? Do you find less of that?—We are getting comparatively little diseased meat. We are not having anything like the quantity we did a few years ago. Probably the introduction of this low-priced colonial meat has had an effect upon that.

1435. I do not know whether there is any other point in your evidence that I have omitted to ask you about that you would like to mention. No doubt some of the members of the Committee will cross-examine you, but if there is any point have omitted, you may mention it?—I think there is nothing but what you have traversed.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1436. I think we understood you to say that you thought the meat imported dead was better than the meat which was brought alive to the ports of Deptford and Birkenhead, and slaughtered there. I suppose when you said that you were referring to the carcases which were just chilled and were not completely frozen?—That is so.

1437. But you would not say that meat which had been frozen, meat which comes over from New Zealand, and meat which has been completely frozen, and has been a long time in ice, was better than the live meat slaughtered at the port of debarkation, would you?—In that case they do not come both alive and dead, so that there can be no comparison between the two.

1438. You can compare sheep as meat with beef as meat?—When I made that remark I was speaking of American refrigerated beef. We are dealing with American bullocks imported alive.

1439. Then you said you had an objection to take samples. Does that refer to cheese too?—No, I think not.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

1440. You are of opinion that cattle killed after a long voyage will not make as good meat in price and quality as the best home-fed?—I think not.

1441. Is it not very difficult for a non-expert retail buyer to tell the difference between the two by looking at it?—Yes, certainly, very difficult.

1442. If that is the case, if a practical scheme of identifying meat which could not be harrassing to the butcher, could be evolved to make the retail buyer know that which he is buying, it would be of great advantage to him, would it not?—It would be some advantage, certainly.

1443. Where foreign meat and English meat are sold at the same price, do you think the retail buyer would prefer English. Take a case where there is not necessarily misrepresentation, but where he is not told what he is buying, and foreign meat and English meat are sold in the same shop?—I think from patriotic motives he might prefer the English.

1444. Do you not think there would be a general preference for that?—No, I do not think so.

1445. How do you account for the amount of representation that admittedly goes on with regard to the origin of meat?—I do not know that there is misrepresentation.

1446. Does not that point to there being a preference

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

preference for English meat?—I do not know that there has been any misrepresentation.

1447. Mr. Cooper gave evidence of it yesterday, and there is a large amount of evidence which came before the Lords' Committee as to the existence of that misrepresentation. I do not think it has been before denied to any great extent?—I have not had the advantage of reading the evidence which was taken before the Lords; but I have seen a very great deal of the meat trade in various shapes and forms, and I do not think there is any very great amount of misrepresentation.

1448. You are brought more in connection with the wholesale sale of meat?—I have some of the largest retail butchers' shops in London under my charge.

Chairman.

1449. Have you retail shops under your inspection?—Yes, a number of them.

1450. I suppose all the retail shops, more or less?—All the retail shops within the City boundary.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1451. Of course, at the Central Meat Market you have the American chilled meat coming in in large quantities, and also the beef of animals slaughtered at the foreign animals wharf?—I have.

1452. Take the chilled meat first; in what form does that come into the market?—It comes in in quarters and wrapped in cloths.

1453. In quarters, and not, as a rule, in small pieces?—No, almost invariably in quarters.

1454. The dealers in the market often cut it off into the smaller pieces?—Yes.

1455. Sometimes they sell it in quarters?—Yes, very frequently; very constantly.

1456. And the meat of animals slaughtered at Deptford, how does that come in?—That usually comes in sides.

1457. And that is either sold in the side, or cut up into quarters, or into similar pieces?—Yes, some of it is sold in sides; some of it is cut up into pieces.

1458. So that if these larger pieces of meat are to be marked before they came to your market, there would be no difficulty in knowing at the market which was foreign and which was British?—In so far as the market piece is concerned, there is not much difficulty about it at all in the form of carcases, but directly you cut it into pieces the difficulty commences.

1459. Is it the case, in your opinion, that very little English beef comes into the London market now; is it chiefly Scotch or foreign?—There is very little English beef coming into the dead meat market. The greater proportion of the English production is absorbed by the provincial towns as regards the best beef and so far as London is concerned; the principal part of the English beef which is sold here, is sold at Islington to butchers who have slaughter-houses.

1460. Now with regard to the misrepresentation which is alleged to exist. I suppose a large amount of foreign meat is purchased by what you call high-class butchers in London?—Yes,

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

there is some considerable amount of foreign meat purchased by West-end butchers, and by others doing a first-class business.

1461. I suppose you have some first-class shops under your supervision?—I have.

1462. Do they make a difference to their customers between the prices of foreign meat and English meat. Have they two prices?—Butchers of that class, when they purchase foreign meat, usually purchase it to supply hotel contracts and restaurants, and establishments of that kind.

1463. Do they not purchase in the market very often?—They do.

1464. Large hotels, for instance, would they purchase from a retail butcher, or direct from the market?—Generally speaking, I think from the retail butchers.

1465. I ask you whether the butchers, to the best of your knowledge, make a difference in price between the foreign and the British?—Those butchers sell at a contract price, and then no doubt there is a very material difference between the contract price and the retail prices in the shop.

Chairman.

1466. If they sold at a contract price I do not know whether you can give an answer to the question. The point is whether that contract would be lower because they were going to supply foreign meat than it would be if the hotel demanded that it must be English; would the price be different?—It would; that is the very reason why butchers of that class buy the foreign meat.

1467. And they make their contract, and I suppose the hotel people do not inquire, do they?—I presume it is understood.

1468. At any rate, the meat suits them?—Yes.

1469. Do you say that these high-class tradesmen buy their foreign meat of people with whom they have contracts, and who sell to them cheaper?—I would not like to go so far as that. I do not know that they do not.

1470. You are not engaged in the hotel trade, so that you do not know?—I have, as I told you, some large retail shops under my observation.

1471. Do you ever see foreign meat exposed for sale in their shops?—I frequently see foreign meat exposed for sale with the understanding of everyone that it is foreign.

1472. Is it sold at a lower retail price than the British meat lying side by side with it?—Under those circumstances it is.

1473. So that any customer going into the shop would know by the price he is asked whether he was buying foreign or British?—Yes, I know shops now into which if you went and said you wanted a piece of Yankee, you would be supplied with Yankee at Yankee prices. By the term Yankee no disrespect is intended, but that is how it is spoken of in the trade.

1474. Do you think that is a usual custom of the retail butchers?—I know that it is so with several whose shops are under my observation.

1475. So that if they supply their customers with

Chairman—continued.

with foreign meat they supply them at a foreign price with Yankee or otherwise?—Yes.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

1476. Suppose that a stranger went into one of these shops and asked for a joint of beef, and did not particularise whether he wanted American or whether he wanted English, would the butcher ask him which he wanted or go and serve him without asking a question?—The purchaser would be sure to have something to say about that which he served him with.

1477. I am putting the case where the purchaser simply asks for a joint of beef and does not particularise as to whether it is to be British or American that he wants; he simply goes in and says, "I want a joint of beef"?—He would probably give the butcher some view of the price he would be prepared to pay.

1478. The case I put to you is, where a man does not particularise, but he simply goes in and asks for a joint of beef; will the butcher in that case ask him whether he wants American or British?—He might not ask him in so many words, but he would probably ask him something to see if it did suit him.

1479. Would he charge him for it as British or American?—It would depend on which it was.

1480. Do you think, in the case of a man going into a shop and asking for a joint of beef and not particularising whether it is to be American or British, that he will be sold American and charged British?—I know of no instance of that kind.

1481. Do you know that it occurs?—I should not like to go so far as that.

1482. You know it is an allegation that has been made over and over again by those in favour of this Bill, that a large quantity of foreign meat is sold as English meat and English prices charged?—There are a great many allegations made.

1483. You are speaking for the City?—Yes.

1484. You told us, in your office of inspector, you see very few old cows and very few old sheep, and that they have been displaced by low-class colonial meat?—I did not intend to say quite as much as that. What I wanted to say was that the low-price colonial meat had had an effect in that direction.

1485. It has not removed this inferior British meat altogether?—It has operated in that direction, but there have been other causes which have also had an effect.

1486. Is there very much difference between low-class colonial meat, as you put it, and old cows and old sheep, such as you were telling us about; I mean healthy old cows and healthy old sheep?—I take it, the flesh of young colonial animals must be greatly superior to that of old cows.

1487. You call it low-class colonial meat?—My words were "low-priced colonial meat."

1488. Do you think if this Bill was passed that the number of inspectors would have to be increased enormously?—The increase, so far as my department is concerned, would be something terrific.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

1489. Could you give us any idea?—My own opinion is this: we have five inspectors now, and I think we should certainly want 15.

1490. Ten more?—Ten more.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1491. You inspect shops now?—Yes.

1492. Why should you want such a largely increased number?—Because the duties would be largely increased. It would be incumbent on those inspectors to see that nothing whatever was sold without its bearing the marks, whatever the marks may be.

1493. They would not examine every piece of beef that was sold in every shop?—They would be liable to criticism if they did not.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

1494. Would it meet with the requirements of the promoters of the Bill if, in future, shops were registered, and no marking at all were to take place?—I think that would have very little effect indeed, because they may be registered without there being any provision whatever as to anything that takes place inside them.

1495. I mean registered, and subject to your supervision as well?—The meat requiring also to be marked.

1496. No; but you being required to see that the provisions were carried out. The trader being obliged to put over his shop "dealer in foreign meat," and with that supervision which you have, would that have the effect which the promoters of the Bill desire?—No, I do not think it would have any effect at all.

1497. Would not the butcher be obliged to inform you where he got his supply from?—I do not think so. I do not think we have any right to ask a butcher where he gets his supply from; we have none at all.

1498. But supposing such a provision were in the Bill which would give you a right to apply to a butcher, as an inspector, in the performance of your duty and office as inspector?—No, I do not think registration would help us at all.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1499. You said the retail shops are under your supervision. The British meat is sold at a British price and the Yankee meat at a Yankee price. Under those circumstances the owner of those shops would not object to marking them. He would have no reason to object because he would have nothing to conceal; they would not object to how the meat is marked as long as the process did not injure the meat?—Then probably the proprietors of the shop would not object, but I think their customers would.

1500. It would put them off the American beef, you think?—I have always found that the public are very suspicious with regard to any marks or any stains or anything whatever about the meat they are buying. We get some New Zealand sheep which are marked light blue on the leg.

1501. On the skin?—Yes; it is a kind of stamp; I do not know what it is, whether it is ink, or what it is; I am told by the salesman to whom those sheep are consigned that many of his

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

his customers object to them on that account; they say their customers do not like this blue mark; they do not know whether it is ink or what it is, and they object to have it at all.

1502. If some means of marking could be devised which had not that drawback, which did not injure the meat in any way, there would be no objection, would there?—I think you would have a difficulty in convincing the public that it did not injure the meat in some way.

1503. The objection would be on the part of the public and on the part of the retail tradesman?—Not so much on the part of the retail tradesman, except that they would find their trade would be curtailed by the fancy of the public.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

1504. Do you know that marking is carried out successfully in Belgium?—I have heard something of it, but I have not much faith in continental methods.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1505. You say here on page 2 of your evidence, that to the best of your belief there is no test by which it is possible to discriminate between British and foreign cheese except in the case of Gorgonzola, &c. May I ask if you express that opinion as an expert, founded on considerable experience in the matter?—I have had something to do with cheese; but I do not profess to be so well up in the matter of cheese as in that of meat.

1506. It is rather the opinion of a layman?—The opinion of an observer rather than anything else.

1507. You do not consider that is sufficiently accurate?—I certainly should not like to make the statement on oath.

Mr. *Brigg.*

1508. I would like to ask you a very few questions; in the first place, under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, do you take any action under that Act yourself?—No, that comes under another section altogether. We have nothing to do with it.

1509. Secondly, you do not treat meat under that Act at all?—No.

1510. You would not consider it to come under the action of that Act of Parliament if a man who was selling food should sell foreign meat instead of English; you see a clause in the Bill making that an offence; you remember the words of that Act say that the thing supplied is not in substance and quality of the article demanded; suppose a man goes to a shop and asks to have English meat, and foreign meat is sold to him, do you consider it comes under the action of that section?—No, I should think not. I do not know to what extent the Merchandise Marks Act may apply, but I may tell you there is at the present time the case of a man who went into a provision shop and asked for an Irish ham, and he was served with an American, and the person who served him was summoned. The case is now under the consideration of the City courts; it has been under consideration two or three times.

Chairman.

1511. Is that under this clause?—No; under the Merchandise Marks Act.

Mr. *Brigg.*

1512. Are you aware that a good deal of English meat of a bad quality is sold at a low price in London and is sold as foreign meat, or sold as English?—I could not go as far as that.

1513. You know the kind I mean?—Yes; but there is a class of meat the supply of which has very greatly diminished; we have comparatively little of that low class English meat.

1514. What has become of it?—I do not know.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1515. Where do the old cows go to?—I do not know.

1516. Is there much complaint to you and this body of inspectors. It is known to the public that this takes place. Do you have any complaints made to you that people are being cheated, or being supplied with foreign meat instead of English?—No; I have had a complaint or two, but they have been very few in number.

1517. Have you reason to suppose that it is the fact that people are being supplied with foreign meat when they think they are getting English meat and they think they are buying English meat?—It is nothing like a universal practice; I have no doubt that with a great number of members of the trade some are mean and miserable enough to do such things as that, but I feel confident in my own mind there is nothing like the universal misrepresentation that some people talk about.

1518. Take the division of shops which the Chairman suggested; are you aware that in some parts of the South of England, Hastings, and, I believe, Brighton, it is the common practice to have butchers' shops divided, having on one side foreign meat and on the other side English meat?—I have seen some such shops, but those have been large shops; there will be a very considerable difficulty in the way of small dealers doing anything of the kind.

1519. You must be aware also that there are shops where butter and margarine are both sold, and where it is quite possible for one to be sold for the other, and where the selling of one for the other would be a fraud, and yet where that business is carried on in very small shops indeed; are you aware of that?—I am; meat is rather a different thing. The carcases of animals have to be cut into joints, and it requires much more amplification than would be necessary for butter and margarine.

1520. You think it would not be convenient to do so unless the shops were large?—I think it would have the effect of compelling small dealers to deal in one article only.

Chairman.

1521. That would be no harm; that would be assisting us in the object we have in view, would it not?—I do not think it would have much effect either way.

1522. It would have this effect, that if a man professed to sell foreign meat and did not sell the other,

Chairman—continued.

other, the purchaser would know what he was doing?—I think the very large proportion of foreign meat is sold now for what it is; the purchaser knows what it is.

1523. Would you say that he knows what it is by the price that he pays?—By that, if by nothing else; but he might by the appearance.

1524. You think that the public can protect themselves?—I think they are quite amply protected as it is in that respect.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1525. The large proportion of the meat in the markets which you inspect is foreign meat?—A very large proportion, not the greater proportion.

1526. From your experience you think butchers are just as honest as other traders?—I think they are quite.

1527. You do not think there is any necessity for this charge of fraud to be universally, or almost universally, made against them?—My experience is not to the effect that there is any justification for it. We are living in an age of puff, and people paint their goods now in very high colours. I do not know that butchers do to a greater extent than anyone else. I do not think they do.

1528. Speaking generally, you think they are desirous of trading honestly with their customers?—Yes, I think they do so. If they would not do it for any better reason, I think they would do so for their own interests.

1529. It is admitted now, is it not, to be an axiom in trade that if you are to succeed you must do the best you can for your customers?—Yes, and I think customers appreciate that to the utmost.

1530. Your special business as an inspector, I understand, is more on sanitary grounds than on any other grounds?—Yes, the powers under which we work are those conferred by the Public Health Act, 1891, and some special powers conferred on the Commissioners of Sewers by the Sewers Acts of 1848 and 1851. Those, I may tell you, renewed to a great extent the powers which were embodied in the charter of the Butchers' Company.

1531. Your special calling is to see that the public have not sold to them meat that is diseased?—That is so, or rather, meat which is unfit for human food.

1532. This meat coming from America, chilled meat, do you find that it is well cared for?—Yes, it is, as a rule, very well cared for.

1533. And that special attention is paid to it more than there used to be?—Yes, they put an experienced man in charge of the refrigerating chambers coming over. It is the object of himself and his assistants to see that they are kept at the proper temperature, and as far as they can to keep dry air in them. They pay the greatest possible attention to that. The superintendent of the cargo would be blamed if he land it in bad condition.

1534. It is the fact, is it not, that the Government of America send a sufficient warranty to you that it is free from disease?—The United States Government?

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

1535. Yes?—The United States meat, as a rule, has shown very little, if any, signs of disease.

1536. Have you ever had any meat from Denmark that has been marked that has shown any indications of disease?—Yes, we have. The Danish meat, in that respect, has been very unsatisfactory. They send their beef across here in sides; each one of those sides bears a label; the label is issued, I believe, by some board of agriculture, or something of that kind, and it is to the effect that the flesh is that of a sound and healthy animal. We have found in very many cases that the carcases of those animals have been suffering from tuberculosis. The Danish cattle appear to be specially subject to that,

1537. The effect of marking is no guarantee that it is free from disease?—Certainly not.

Chairman.

1538. Is that marked in Denmark?—It is marked in Denmark.

1539. Under some regulation there?—By some Government department.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1540. Do you know it is passed by an inspector as being fit for human food. That is the meaning of the mark?—That is the meaning of the mark; they say it is the flesh of a healthy animal.

1541. You find it is not so?—We find it is not so.

1542. Have you a lot of pork which comes from Ostend sometimes?—Yes, there is a great deal of pork comes from Ostend.

1543. That is marked, is it not?—There is a system in vogue there by which the owners of the pigs pay, I think it is 1½*d.*, to have them stamped, and then they are stamped and they are sent over here.

1544. Do you find disease among them when they have come here?—Yes, they are more unsatisfactory than the Danish beef. We find them suffering from all kinds of disease, lung disease, typhoid, measles, and goodness knows what.

Chairman.

1545. Are you speaking of dead or live pigs?—Dead.

1546. You can tell all those, can you?—The carcase has borne unmistakeable signs of it.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1547. Are they refrigerated or frozen?—They are simply sent fresh.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1548. That goes to prove that the mere mark on the meat is not any guarantee to the public?—It is not, as regards Ostend pigs or Danish beef.

1549. I understood you to say a little while ago that if this marking were to become law it would make a great change in your work.' Do you think it would make a very serious change throughout the country?—I have no doubt it would. In reading this Bill, I have inferred

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

that any duties under it were to be discharged by the sanitary inspectors. I think you would find that the sanitary inspectors throughout the country would as a rule be quite unequal to discriminate between British and foreign meat.

1550. That is a question I wanted to ask you particularly?—They have been selected as a rule for their acquaintance with drains, and matters of overcrowding, and something or other of that kind, but very few of them indeed are qualified to become experts in meat.

1551. Do you think they should be men of great experience and unblemished character for work of that kind?—There is no office in which people are open to greater temptations.

Chairman.

1552. Are you not under a mistake. The local authority has to appoint the inspectors, but the Bill rather indicated they are to appoint inspectors specially for this purpose?—This Bill in two or three respects appears to follow the lines of the Public Health Act, inasmuch as it makes it an offence to have such-and-such things in possession.

1553. It is not necessarily so?—Not necessarily.

1554. It is merely a matter of construction?—The local authority could appoint inspectors specially for this purpose, especially qualified. They might not do so, but it rather indicates that is the intention of the Bill.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1555. Supposing the public authorities did decide to appoint special inspectors, do you think it would be easy to find such men?—I do not find it very easy. When we want inspectors we have a great difficulty in getting good men.

1556. They must be expert men?—They must be men who are well acquainted with the trade; they should know every trick and turn. Their duty is to take action against men who do know their business thoroughly.

1557. We were told in evidence the other day there was a cargo of sheep, I think, in the Thames last week which numbered 90,000. How many inspectors would it require, do you think, to see that the whole of that number of sheep were properly worked; can you form any opinion?—It would take a very long time certainly; if the number of inspectors were limited it would take a longer time, but it would be a big job.

1558. May I take it from your evidence you think the Bill impracticable and unnecessary?—I think it is unnecessary, to put it plainly.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

1559. You are inspector in the City, are you not; have you anything to do with the Deptford Market?—Nothing whatever.

1560. Does much of the Deptford meat come into your market?—Yes, a very large proportion.

1561. Can you tell that, when it comes in, from English meat?—I can. I cannot tell you how I tell, but I know it.

1562. You think you can?—Yes.

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

1563. Do you think you can tell in every case?—There might be cases in which we might be wrong. I could form an opinion at all times, and nine times out of ten I should be right.

1564. Can you tell American chilled meat?—Yes.

1565. You can tell that in a moment?—Yes.

1566. What proportion of chilled American meat comes into the Central Market?—The daily supply at the Central Market is about 1,200 tons; I should think the daily supply of American would be from 100 to 150 tons, that is of American chilled meat.

1567. And Deptford meat, killed in this country, from America?—I should think of that there would be 200 to 250 tons.

1568. That would be larger than the chilled?—Yes.

1569. Do you think it is as good; does it improve the quality of meat to chill it?—No, I do not know there is anything to be obtained by chilling it, but by the process of keeping it in a chilled room you are able to keep the meat until it is just in the best possible condition for consumption, that is to say you are able to hang it for a length of time by which you get it to perfection.

1570. Of course you can do that whether it is chilled or not?—You stand very great risk of your meat becoming putrid if you have not got it in the chilling room.

1571. Does not chilling to some extent take away the taste unless it is very skilfully done?—No, not simply chilling. Frozen I have no doubt would, but by chilling I mean keeping the meat at a temperature of some 34° or 36.°

1572. When you say that you think chilled American meat would be better than country killed lairage meat, do you mean it would taste better or be of better quality, or in what way would it be better?—I think the cattle imported alive must have lost something by the voyage; they must have lost something by the long journey to the seaboard and their voyage here.

1573. I suppose you have been to Deptford?—Yes.

1574. You have seen them there?—Yes.

1575. Of late years?—Yes, very recently.

1576. Do they appear to have suffered in any way from their voyage?—Some of them are a bit footsore, and some of them are upset at the time of landing.

1577. Is there anything to indicate if they were kept a few days to recover the damage that they would be in as good a condition as ever?—I think they would require to be kept a good many days, and then there would probably be some little in the way of shrinkage in the cattle themselves; I mean their food on board ship and in the lairages at Deptford would be scarcely as good as the food on which they have been fattened in America.

1578. Is there any reason why it should not be as good?—I think there would be some little difficulty in the moving of the cattle.

1579. I have seen very excellent food given to cattle in lairages?—No doubt they keep cattle as nearly to the original food as they can, and it may be if they were kept a sufficiently long time

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

time the effect of the voyage would be quite got over.

1580. Is there any difference in the class of cattle which is killed in America and that which is sent over here alive?—I think none, or very little. I do not know of any specific distinction at all.

1581. You say the voyage of the bullock that was subject to all the vicissitudes contingent on an ocean voyage, even in the most approved and humane manner, could not be accomplished without considerable discomfort to the animal. I suppose to bring a lot of bullocks into Chicago and slaughter them there, could hardly be done, to some extent, without much discomfort to the animals there?—The grievance is greatly minimised in that case.

1582. You think that a British-bred bullock might possibly prefer six days at sea to a couple of days' journey to Chicago?—If I wanted my bullocks to come out well, I should not like to send them six days to sea.

1583. I take it that most of the big hotels now have foreign meat, and supply their customers with foreign meat?—Very many of them now do, and I believe all of them, or pretty nearly all, make their arrangements for the supply by contract.

1584. Then one may take it, if one goes to the Métropole, or the Savoy, or the Grand, that one is just as likely to get foreign meat as English?—Yes, I think so.

1585. Have you ever heard any complaints from any of the people who go and dine at those hotels of the inferiority of the meats?—No; those would be scarcely likely to reach me.

Wednesday, 21*st July* 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brigg.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.
Mr. Doughty.
Mr. Hozier.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Sir John Kinloch.
Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. A. H. Smith.

SIR ELLIOTT LEES IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ANDREW HUTCHESON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

1586. YOU attend as the representative of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland?—Yes.

1587. And you speak with the authority of the commission of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture?—Yes.

1588. And further represent the County Council of Perthshire?—Yes.

1589. Of which body you are the vice-convener?—Yes.

1590. Is that vice-chairman?—Vice-chairman.

1591. And you farm land both in Perthshire and Forfarshire?—I farm along with my son about 1,600 acres in those two counties.

1592. And you know a good deal about agriculture in the east and north-east of Scotland?—Well, I ought to, sir; I have been a farmer all my days.

1593. You are constantly in the city of Perth?—Yes, I live in Perth.

1594. And the city of Perth is the centre of the live stock trade of Scotland?—It certainly is the centre of the store stock trade; I do not say of the fat trade, but it is the centre of the store stock trade in Scotland, if not in Great Britain.

1595. A resolution was passed at a general meeting of the Highland and Agricultural Society in Glasgow, about a fortnight or three weeks ago?—Yes.

1596. As a result of that you were asked to attend here to represent the society?—Yes; I was asked along with Mr. Duthie, of Aberdeenshire, to attend here, but he could not possibly attend with me.

1597. And this resolution, which I may as well read, was passed?—Yes.

1598. "This society protests strongly against the provision in the Agricultural Produce (Marks) Bill which would regard as British meat the carcases of foreign animals slaughtered at British ports of landing, and urges that the measure be so amended as to provide that meat which is regarded as British meat shall be meat which has been fed in this country"?—Yes, that was carried unanimously.

Chairman—continued.

1599. The opinion of all the bodies that you represent is against Clause 15 of the Bill, is it?—Certainly.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1600. Against that one clause?—Yes, the resolution that was passed by the Highland Society was unanimously in favour of the Bill, with the exception of that clause.

Chairman.

1601. You do not think there would be any great difficulties in connection with the marking of meat?—I cannot speak practically on that subject, but I do not see that there should be insuperable difficulties, and it seems to be done in most continental countries.

1602. I think you only speak from hearsay?—Well, I speak from hearsay, but I know it to be the case.

1603. I see what you say here is, "greater difficulties have often, however, been overcome"?—Yes.

1604. And you would like dealers in foreign meat to be registered, and made to display over their doors in large letters the fact that they are such?—Yes, I think that more important than marking even; that they should tell the public what they really sell.

1605. From your printed evidence I gather that you do not believe that to follow that course would have the effect of lowering the price of the home article?—No.

1606. Can you tell us why?—Well, I think it would be more inclined to lower the price of the foreign article than the home article; I think the mere fact of its being marked; I have no doubt plenty of people would buy it.

1607. Do you think the effect of marking or registration would be to cause less to be imported?—Well, I do not know; I think it would have the effect of regulating the importation, at any rate, because if it had the effect of lowering the price of foreign meat I do not think it could stand to be much lowered. The other day we saw that the price of the mutton was 3½*d.* or

Chairman—continued.

4*d.* a pound, and if the effect of marking was to take a penny or 1½*d.* off that, I think the foreigner could not send it to us because there is only about that clear on the whole transaction.

1608. He only makes about a penny?—I understand it takes 2*d.* to 2½*d.* to pay the expenses of carriage, insurance and other expenses to this country; therefore, if you deduct that from the gross price he has now just about 1½*d.* clear at the other side; but would you allow me to explain—I do not want to damp the importation of foreign beef—I know quite well we could not do without it; I only want it kept in its own place. I do not want to say that it should not be sent.

1609. But you desire that it should be marked distinctly?—Sold for what it is.

1610. You find, however, from the visits you have paid to Smithfield and the other markets that there is practically no attempt made to sell foreign meat for home meat?—I visited Smithfield Market on Saturday and I found there that the wholesale dealers said that even if they were willing they could not cheat, so to speak, the wholesale buyers that came to them, because these wholesale buyers were so well up in the trade that they knew quite well what they were buying. That is when they buy it wholesale.

1611. I see you say here that very few of your consumers in Scotland have ever tasted foreign beef?—Not to their knowledge at any rate. I have no doubt that plenty of them have, but they were not aware of the fact.

1612. I take it from that you mean that no meat is ever sold as foreign meat in Scotland?—There is not nearly so much sold in Scotland certainly as there is in the City of London. I do not think there are many people in Scotland who profess to sell foreign beef. It certainly is sold, because Glasgow is our only port, and we get 1,500 to 2,000 foreign cattle there every week.

1613. Do you imply that there is any deception practised upon the purchasers?—I do not know whether you would call it deception or not, but if a person goes in and asks for a roast of beef he should get what he wants. The west-end customers in Glasgow naturally expect they are getting Scotch beef, but I have no doubt they often are getting foreign beef. The butchers' say it is no fraud at all; the one is as good as the other.

1614. I suppose there is not very much difference in the quality?—Between some classes of beef—the better class fed American beef I have no doubt is pretty good, but as you saw at Deptford there are great discrepancies in the quality.

1615. You would like the Committee to look at a passage from the "Mark Lane Express," I think?—There is a leading article in it which appeared on the Manchester Show-day.

1616. I think it will be better for me to pass that round to the Committee?—I am quite agreeable.

1617. It is only an extract from a newspaper, is it?—It is only an extract from a newspaper, but I put it in there because it was from the leading English agricultural newspaper, and I thought it would have more weight on that account than coming from a Scotch newspaper.

1618. Do you think the effect of such a Bill as this would be to raise the price of meat?—I think it would have the effect of keeping it at a level.

1619. Keeping it not higher than it is now?—No, I would not say so. At present in Scotland we have a moderately fair price for fat beef. If all we hear is true about the imported American beef at present, and all we see of it when it leaves their shores, they never get back anything at all for some of those shipments. I do not suppose that could be lowered much.

1620. I suppose it still pays very well to raise good stock?—It does not pay very well; nothing like what it used to do in my younger days before we knew what American beef was; still it is the only thing that is keeping agriculture alive at all in this country. If the cattle trade goes as the grain trade has gone, we may shut up shop altogether, because it is the only paying province in agriculture.

1621. Is there anything else you would like to say?—Oh, no, except that I would like to impress upon the gentlemen of the Committee very strongly (and I represent the opinion of all these bodies spoken of, and my own opinion and the opinion of agriculturists in my district) that we would rather have no Bill at all than take a Bill by which cattle slaughtered on the shores of Great Britain of American breed and fed in America should be called British. I think we would be better without any Bill at all than with a Bill having that clause in it.

1622. As some of the Committee desire it, we had better have that "Mark Lane" article on the notes. The article is as follows: "*The Sale of Foreign Meat.*—In a seaside resort of some considerable popularity in the North, there is, says a correspondent whose word we can accept, a butcher who poses as doing the best trade in the town. The word 'best' does not in this sense mean the largest, but rather, as is plain from the context, the highest class trade, and in any case the most remunerative. Our correspondent dealt with this particular tradesman, and, as he puts it, 'although there was no fault to be found with the quality and condition of the meat, still there was something peculiar about it.' The sequel readily shows what this was, for one morning the writer of this letter, being troubled with insomania, took a walk as soon as it was daybreak. Passing the butcher's shop, he was surprised to see whole sheep and quarters of beef being unloaded from a waggon which hailed from a neighbouring seaport town. What astonished him still more was the fact that the carcases were encased in canvas, which was dripping wet, and which in places bore traces of ice. He endeavoured to enter into conversation with the men in charge, but found them strictly uncommunicative. The same day he paid a visit to the shop, and took the opportunity of carefully inspecting the stock. He came to the conclusion, and he is not a man without some experience, that on the counter facing the window there was a small collection of prime joints of the best

Chairman—continued

English beef and the choicest Welsh mutton, and that in the background, which was conveniently fenced off by a business desk of abnormal proportions, and a chopping board, there was a large collection of American beef and Australian mutton. He determined upon a test, and ordered a beautiful sirloin which appeared in front. He noted the shape of the cut and counted the bones. It weighed 6 lbs. 11 ozs. He paid for it and departed. When he had returned to his lodgings he gave orders that he was to see the meat before it was cooked. He did so, and this is what he says about it: 'It was a totally different colour to the joint I had chosen; it had much the same general appearance, but it had half a rib more and weighed six and a-half ounces more than I had paid for." To make assurance doubly sure, he did no more than make notes of his observations until he required a further supply. This time he decided upon a leg of mutton, and managed in choosing it to make a distinctive mark upon the shank. When it came home this mark was not to be found, and it weighed a few ounces more, although the foot had been removed. He then went to the butcher and made his complaint. It was received with indignation, and met with the assertion that no foreign meat was sold in the shop—which may have been literally true, for our correspondent's experience was that home-produced meat was sold but not delivered. Then the assistant, who had been engaged in unloading the meat, whispered to his master and promptly vanished. As soon as this was done the butcher became most apologetic, and declared that it was a mistake on the part of his assistant, and offered to refund the difference. As we are informed that this matter will not rest here, we cannot say more about the individual case, but there is a general lesson which can well be drawn from it. We are frequently told that imported meat is as good as home-grown. Many of us hold a very different belief; but, whichever opinion is correct, we are entitled to what we ask for, and the case above referred to is neither more nor less than a fraud on the purchaser. It is a strong argument in favour of the proposal that foreign meat shall be marked, or that dealers in it shall take out a licence, and publicly announce the fact that they sell imported meat. The public has a right to demand this, and it would clearly be to the interest of the home producer."

Mr. *Doughty.*

1623. Are you a farmer?—Yes.

1624. And president, I suppose, of some farmers' associations?—Well, I am a director of the Highland and Agricultural Society and vice-president of the Chamber of Agriculture, and vice-convener of the County Council of Perth; I suppose principally because I am a farmer.

1625. Are we to understand that you are a representative man of all the Scotch farmers?—Well, I consider I am.

1626. You are here, I suppose, for the purpose of giving the views of the Scotch farmers upon this subject?—I am here, sir, by the direction of the Highland, and as representing the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

1627. You were down at Deptford yesterday?—I was.

1628. You saw the class and quality of cattle that was imported there?—Yes.

1629. Do you find any fault with the quality of beasts that are being killed?—Well, the South American cattle certainly were very rough specimens; a lot of the States cattle we saw were very good.

1630. You do not think the public are suffering from the kind of meat they are getting?—I do not think any meat is as good as a prime Scotch-fed bullock.

1631. We have heard that before, but I am asking you generally?—I think if it is sold to the public as being British fed, they are being defrauded.

1632. I am not asking you that question at all. What I want to know is this; do you think that these cattle sold there are not as good as the average English beast that is raised, and sold at a fair?—Perhaps as good as the average English, but not as good as prime Scotch.

1633. Then of course we are to understand from you that the best beef sold in this country is undoubtedly prime Scotch?—Well, it is generally thought so, and I believe the opinion is right.

1634. Would it be unfair to assume, then, that ordinary English beef fed in England competes against prime Scotch?—Well, no; prime Scotch is generally the top quotation of the English market.

1635. But I presume you are in favour of marking meat?—Yes; I am in favour of marking foreign meat.

1636. For what reason?—Because I think it ought to be sold for what it really is.

1637. Do you think the public are being defrauded thereby?—Yes, I think if a man wants the best British beef and gets a roast off an American beast he is defrauded.

1638. Let us look at the matter from your stand point. You are dealing in the best Scotch beef and a purchaser goes into a shop and he asks for a piece of Scotch beef and he gets a sirloin (say) of English beef supplied him instead, is that fraudulent?—Well, yes, if he asks for Scotch beef, and gets English, if he asks for it, certainly.

1639. Then I take it to be consistent with your desire we ought to have English beef marked?—No, I would class all British beef alike; we live in the same country.

1640. Why?—Our friend the Rev. Macrae says we are all Britishers; he would not think of calling us "English" and "Scotch." I do not want the beef separated more than any other thing is separated.

1641. We have now a British Empire, have we not?—Yes, but America is not part of it unfortunately.

1642. Canada is?—Canada is certainly, but the States are not.

1643. So you exclude Canada from the operation of this Bill?—No, I would not exclude any country outside our own.

1644. Is it not inconsistent not to mark Scotch beef when English beef competes against Scotch beef

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

beef?—No, I would consider the whole of the British nation as one. I wish they would consider Ireland the same, and give her the same as Glasgow, Liverpool, and London have, namely, fat cattle with compulsory slaughter; and why the Minister of Agriculture does not do that I cannot understand. I should place them all on an equality.

1645. Am I to understand your desire is exceptional legislation for Scotch and English?—It is not exceptional legislation. I want foreign meat sold for foreign, and home for home, and let the purchaser take his choice of what he likes best.

1646. We hardly look upon Canadian as foreign, do we?—I do, and I expect most of the farmers in England and Scotland do.

1647. Have you seen any chilled beef?—Yes.

1648. And frozen beef?—Yes.

1649. Do you think the ordinary consumer has any difficulty in telling a piece of frozen beef in a butcher's shop?—Not if he saw it in the carcase; but if he saw it cut up into roasts and steaks, I do not think he would know.

1650. Are you aware the chief of the evidence produced here has gone to prove that it is very easy to tell a piece of frozen meat from English?—It is very easy to tell frozen beef, but quite difficult to tell chilled beef; they are quite different commodities. Frozen beef when thawed has always an appearance that the practised eye could detect, but I do not think that nine-tenths of the purchasers going into shops would be able to tell it when cut up in small bits.

1651. If they could tell it you would consider that that was a marking of the beef, would not you?—No, I would mark it further still, so that they could not make a mistake.

1652. Tell us how you think it could be marked so that no mistake could be made?—I have said before here that I am a practical farmer, but I do not think that falls under the knowledge of a practical farmer. It is done in all continental countries, and I do not see that it is an insuperable difficulty, but if it is, it is quite easy to licence the men who deal in foreign beef; let them expose the sign in a prominent part of the shop, when they do so, and I will sell my British beef against them.

1653. You not only want meat marked, but each person who sells it to be licensed?—There are two different forms the operation might take. It might take both, or merely the mere marking, or the license to deal in foreign and deal in home.

1654. Which do you desire?—If I had my own choice, I would have our own sold in separate shops, and if a man liked to deal in foreign beef let him deal in that in other shops. We would sell the pure home beef and take our chance.

1655. What would you do in the case of large English butchers who cannot get sufficient sweetbreads for their customers? Would you tell them to send their customers to the foreign shop for them?—If they could not get them in the home shop they could go and buy them in the foreign; I would not deprive them altogether of the sweetbreads if they were anxious to have them.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

1656. I want to ask you again about this marking. You say you desire the meat should be marked; tell us how you would mark the meat so that there would be no mistake so far as the public were concerned?—I was told by a very large salesman in Glasgow in the foreign cattle trade that it could be easily marked by an ink pencil, drawing it three times down the carcase; you could not cut up the carcase without having some of that mark in it. If you come to cut it into very small pieces, I do not say you could carry that out.

1657. Considering that Scotch beef is of such good quality and that there is only a comparatively small quantity of it comes to this country, as compared with the bulk, would it not be better to mark Scotch beef as Scotch?—No, certainly not.

1658. But why not?—Because I would never mark an article produced at home. I would mark every blessed thing that comes from a foreign country, lock, stock, and barrel; it is our own country, and we ought to support our own industries.

1659. If your object is that the public should not be deceived, in your own interest then why not have your own meat marked?—Because I consider marking is not a thing that we ought to ask any of our home produce to submit to.

1660. Is not your main object or your main reason for objecting to have your meat marked that you think it would depreciate its value?—Well, it might depreciate its value in the eyes of some consumers of marked beef, and if there is to be any depreciation from marking it certainly should not be our own home beef that should bear it.

1661. Why should you desire to depreciate the article?—I do not want to depreciate it, I merely want them to sell it for what it is, and that they must have some way of knowing what it is; and if a man sells American beef, let him say it is American. I know plenty of men that have made mints of money by selling American beef for home beef.

1662. Do not you think if your Scotch beef was marked, and that that was the warranty, you would get a bigger price for it; is it not possible?—It is quite possible; I do not think that thing is insuperable, and I hold to my opinion that all foreign produce ought to be marked.

1663. Do you think there is any fear that if you mark foreign beef, considering the quality of the foreign beef coming now (I mean Canadian cattle) that you are not likely to give it a special character?—A good character, do you mean?

1664. Yes, a good character?—If it gets that we must just take our chance. I am, for one, quite willing to run that risk. I think myself, and my fellow agriculturists are too——

1665. Have you really thought of that question?—Yes.

1665*. You know that the effect of marking Danish butter is that it makes a better price than English butter in the market now?—I have heard that said; it depends on the brand; some brands, I understand, of Danish butter will make more. In the meantime, we hear a great deal

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

that is derogatory to Danish butter, whether it is true or not.

1666. I want you to tell me why you desire to support this Bill?—Because I want the home agriculturist placed on a fair footing; let him stand all the competition possible, but let it be honest competition, not dishonest.

1667. You were asked by the Chairman a moment ago whether you thought it would improve the price of Scotch and English beef; I did not quite understand your answer; what is your opinion about that?—My opinion is that there is as much spirit in our British population as to prefer our own produce.

1668. That is not an answer to the question, you know; I will put it as plain as I can; do you think if this Bill were to pass into law that English and Scotch and Welsh beef and mutton would make a better price than it does now?—I think it would keep them from deteriorating in price.

1669. Then is the Committee to understand that you think the price of this food will deteriorate unless this Bill is passed?—It is being injuriously affected by the American beef being sold as Brttish fed and killed.

1670. Then we are to take it from you that you fear the price of English beef will continue to depreciate unless this Bill is passed?—I cannot tell what is in the future for English beef, but I say what I said before: that if the price of beef is going to deteriorate we may shut the shop as far as British agriculture is concerned, because that is the only thing we have to stand by at present.

1671. May I take it from you that what you want for the article you grow, and what you wish the English farmers to have for the articles they grow, is protection for their own special trade?—No, it is not.

1672. Surely if you are going to depreciate an article from abroad in order to praise yours it amounts to that?—If you call it protection to sell an article for what it really is, then I want protection.

1673. No, no, that is not the question?—That is what I understood.

1674. I ask you this question: are you of opinion that English beef is going to depreciate in value if this Bill is not passed?—I cannot tell what is in the future. It all depends upon the extent of importation in the meat supply of the world. Some think, as regards the meat supply of the world, that the population is to overtake it; others again think it is to increase to such an extent that the price will be lowered; but that is in the future, and none of us can tell.

1675. You have told us just a moment ago that your object in supporting the Bill was that the price of your beef might be maintained where it is now?—I want to sell my beef as British beef. I merely want that the beef is sold as British against the American sold as American, and we will take our chance of where it will land us. I cannot understand how that is not clear enough.

Mr. *Brigg*.

1676. I think you said you were convinced that the wholesale dealers from what you had seen down at the chilled meat market are not likely to be deceived?—No, not buying from the carcase butcher.

1677. Then you will say at once that there is no need of any protection against wholesale importation of meat as far as dealers are concerned?—According to what I saw in Smithfield they are not likely to be deceived. My experience is in Scotland; I have not very much knowledge in England except visiting these markets occasionally.

1678. You are convinced, as you say, from what you saw, that there is no necessity for protection as far as the wholesale dealer is concerned?—No, but some things are done very curiously in Smithfield Market. I do not know that I place a great deal of confidence in some of the transactions there.

1679. I am afraid we cannot go into that, neither you nor I?—No.

1680. You still think that the retail purchaser ought to be protected in the sense of buying the thing he asks for?—Yes, he ought to get what he buys.

1681. It has been asked, by the gentleman who preceded me, if you have any suggestion for marking or making any marks upon this meat that would be at all likely to be efficacious; you know something about it?—I have never had any experience of marking beef; but if our continental neighbours can do it, although they are more advanced in some things than we are, we might follow their example.

1682. With regard to the marking outside the carcase, the three marks on each side, that is the only mark there is on the carcase itself, it is a question of marking the small piece of meat in the butcher's shop we have to consider; have you any suggestion for doing that?—No, I cannot say I have. My own opinion inclines to the registration, and making them display the origin of the beef that they do sell; in fact, if I were to get my own way, I should sell it in different shops.

1683. I think you have said a strong point in your mind was that all shops should be registered which sell foreign meat?—Not only should be registered, but should display a very prominent sign that they did sell it.

1684. Display the name registered as dealing in foreign meat?—Yes, most decidedly.

1685. I suppose you are aware, from what you have seen since you have been in London, that it especially refers to the dealers in meat in the south part of England. There are certain times in the year when veal cannot be bought in England; all the veal that is sold is imported from abroad?—Yes.

1686. In the best butchers' shops they are obliged to buy this foreign veal or not have it at all; we are assured that that is a fact?—Well, they can go to the foreign shop and buy the veal.

1687. Also in reference to kidneys and sweetbreads; they also are very largely foreign?—If they are willing to eat the kidneys and sweetbreads of the foreign animal let them buy them in a foreign shop.

1688. You would say, then, in the case of a man who was registered for selling English meat

it

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

it must be distinctly understood that he does not sell veal, or kidneys, or sweetbreads?—Unless he is registered to sell these as foreign articles.

1689. That would lead, as I think, to these men wishing to be registered as dealers in foreign meat. There would, of course, be no stigma attached to the registration?—Personally, I do not wish any stigma attached to it. If they sell foreign beef as foreign beef let them sell it.

1690. I cannot help thinking it would have some effect, at any rate, by registering them publicly. At the same time, when we find they are obliged for their customers' sakes to sell these things which are distinctly foreign, do not you think that would have a tendency to lead all shops to mark themselves foreign?—Yes, it would have that tendency, but it would end, I think, by selling foreign beef as foreign beef. If a man wanted a roast of beef and wanted the best Scotch, they could not serve him with best foreign without transgressing the law.

1691. No, but still foreign meat will have to be dealt with in the shops of these first-class customers, which will oblige them to register themselves as dealers in foreign meat. Then all butchers are dealers, and registered as dealers, in foreign meat?—Yes.

1692. That being the case there is, as I say, no stigma attaching to the name of a man because he sells foreign meat?—No.

1693. You say the man going into the shop and asking for one thing would get it; but if he goes into the shop where both are sold indiscriminately there would be all the same chance of his getting foreign instead of English as there is now?—Yes, if it was not marked there would be that.

1694. Now you see we have done away with the registration in that case. We have got all registered because they must be registered, and we have got English and foreign together in the same shop, and the same liability for one being sold in the place of the other as to-day?—Yes, I see the difficulty.

1695. That brings us back again to what I have mentioned before; how are you going to mark small pieces of meat. The whole thing sticks at that point. How are you going to mark small pieces of meat. You say you have no suggestion whatever as to that?—Well, I cannot say that I have any practical experience myself as to that; I am merely a breeder and feeder of cattle; I am not a meat marksman or salesman; more's the pity; if I had been a meat salesman I would have been able to make a fortune by this time.

1696. We may take it you really have no opinion as to the possibility of marking small pieces of meat?—I could not give any practical opinion. I must say I have never seen meat marking carried out.

1697. Now we will pass on to another question. Supposing for a moment it could be marked both wholesale and retail in some way we have not seen yet, I think, if I understood you, you said you thought the effect of that would be to reduce the price of that foreign meat if so marked. It would have to be sold for such?—I do not know. I understand some people think it might do that; other people think it will send everybody to that marked beef because it will be cheaper, but if they find it is going really to be sold cheaper than at present why should not the public get it cheaper? What I object to is that a butcher comes and buys these beasts and goes and sells them as British. After buying one or two, a man perhaps puts "British fed beef" on the door and then goes and sells his others.

1698. We know what your objections are, and that you are quite clear about your objecting to all what we call English-killed meat; that is, meat killed on English soil. You object to that being sold as English meat?—Yes, I would rather have no Bill at all than a Bill with that clause in it.

1699. You said (it was rather a technical point) that you would have the shops separate; that is, one shop selling only English and another selling only foreign?—That is a practical way out of the difficulty; that you could not get over without fraud, at any rate.

1700. Perhaps you live away so far in Scotland, where only good meat is sold, that you cannot answer this; but are you not aware that a good many butchers' shops are what we might call first, second, third, fourth, and fifth-rate, until you come down to a class of English meat which is positively much worse than any foreign meat that is imported. Are you aware of that. Perhaps you have not attended some of the markets in the manufacturing districts?—Well, I do not think there is any British beef (I prefer to call it "British") any worse than some of that South American beef we saw yesterday, at any rate.

1701. Excuse me, when you call it British meat or British beef, do you know that some cows or oxen exposed in a market alive in England for sale have been going perhaps eight or 10 years in a plough in Switzerland or drawing carts in Spain or different countries. That is the class of beef I am speaking of; not the class of animals we find in these markets. That class is sold?—As foreign beef?

1702. You say you would divide the shops into two kinds, and one should sell foreign; would not that be injuring the trade of the fourth and fifth-rate class of beef?—These animals that would be labouring in that way would be foreign.

1703. You do not propose to extinguish them altogether?—I think it will be a great deal better if you extinguished that class.

Sir *John Kinloch.*

1704. From your evidence, I gather that your chief reason for advocating the passing of this Bill, as you suggest, into law, would be that the public should get what they ask for?—Yes.

1705. That is your chief reason?—That is what the agriculturists in Scotland wish; they wish their beef sold for what it is, and to let it take its chance for anything else.

1706. You appear here as a witness for the sake of the agriculturists, and not for the public?—Yes, I am certainly a witness for agriculturists; I want to see the public get fair play, too.

Sir *John Kinloch*—continued.

1707. This Bill is promoted, as you know, for the good of the agriculturists ?—I suppose it was meant for them.

1708. From the evidence you have heard and read, you will see now there are two considerations before the Committee. The first is that this Bill, if passed into law, may benefit the farmer by raising the price?—Well, I do not say it will raise it, but I would treat the whole meat market on a fair level.

1709. Some witnesses have said it will raise the price ?—I think we are past the day of seeing anything raised in price in Great Britain, as far as I have seen.

1710. That is the first consideration the agriculturists have to consider ?—Yes.

1711. The second is that it may reduce the price of home beef if the public find they can get nearly as good an article for less money. These are really the two considerations before us; so that those who are opposed to the Bill and those that are in favour of the Bill are equally in favour of the agriculturists. Do you see that ?—Yes.

1712. It is for us to consider which will benefit the agriculturists most, the passing of the Bill or not passing it ?—Yes, I understand that, Sir John.

1713. Now they are both matters of opinion; there is no certainty of either ?—No.

1714. In your evidence you say you are of opinion that it will raise the price of home beef ?—I do not think so. I think myself that these foreign importations will always keep the price of home beef at a comparatively lower level than we have been accustomed to.

1715. Then the only benefit of the Bill would be to steady the price ?—Yes.

1716. It would have a steadying effect ?—Yes.

1717. Then you would set off against that the public going to the cheap shops who register. You think the risk is worth running ?—Yes; for my own part I would have no fear about running the risk. I would open a shop to-morrow and sell my beef against American.

1718. With Canadian there is a risk ?—There is risk in everything human; but my opinion, and the opinion of those who have sent me here, is that such a thing is practical.

1719. But you must give some reasons for the faith that is in you, it is only an opinion ?—I think there is still as much spirit left among us as would prefer our own produce to foreign produce, especially if that comes in here and gets liable to Clause 15 of the Bill; you exercise the wand of a magician if you make a carcase landed on our shores for six hours an English beast; that, I think, is legislation run wild myself.

1720. In that I agree with you. You think the English middle class are not so patriotic that they would rush to buy our beef at 2*d.* a pound more than the other ?—I do not think we could sell it at 2*d.* more.

1721. That is the difference in Smithfield ?—It is not the difference when you come to retail; I want the retail difference.

1722. That is a matter for the public, but the public have taken no interest in this Bill, or very little, compared with the agriculturists; you are aware of that?—It touches the agriculturists quicker, I daresay, than the public, but I have no doubt that if you read that article that I quoted from the "Mark Lane Express," the public do take a certain interest in it; and I have no doubt that if they were not getting British beef when they thought they were buying it they would feel very much aggrieved.

1723. You say if the price of our beef did go down we might as well shut up shop ?—Yes, you know that as well as I do, Sir John. You are a Perthshire landlord; you know that the backbone of our agriculture is at present the live-stock industry. If we were dependent upon grain and potato growing we could not keep it up.

1724. Therefore I wish to press this: Is it worth while running any risk ?—We are going to run the same risk; we are going to have the same cattle coming in alongside of our own; we have the risk of all the supply of the world, the live stock surplus, it will all be dumped on our shores and done at any price.

1725. You were saying that if this Bill passed it might reduce the importation; now you say there is plenty coming ?—I think myself that if meat was getting any lower in price, I do not care whether it is British or American, I do not think the Americans are able to put it into this country at any very considerable reduction of price; if you began to take a halfpenny or a penny a pound off you would take the whole of the profit they get the other end altogether.

1726. They have an inexhaustible source to draw from ?—For a good deal they send up now they never get anything back whatever we are told; that state of matters cannot last for very long.

1727. I see in your evidence you say: "If the effect of carrying out the provisions of a Bill such as this is the lowering of the price of beef and mutton all round, then certainly it will be a bad day for both proprietor and tenant of land in Great Britain; but if the value of land in this country can only be obtained (I suppose it means 'maintained') by perpetrating and legalising a fraud, the matter would be better brought to a bearing at once"?—Yes, that is my opinion. If you are going to keep up the price of land in this country by getting American frauds, and dealing with foreign produce and calling it "home," I would sooner quit the whole business altogether.

1728. Do not you think that is a matter for the public to attend to rather than the agriculturists ?—Well, the public will be without the agriculturists if you are to stamp them out.

1729. Then are we to go plainly to the public and point out that they are being cheated?—Yes, I think the Legislature ought to keep the public from being cheated. I should think that was one of the main things of their existence, to stop fraud.

1730. You are a witness, of course, for the sake of the agriculturists to-day, as you have said ?—Well, it is natural.

1731. That piece in your evidence entirely affects the public, does it not?—It is fraud. The public who buy the beef are being imposed upon.

1732. Would

Sir *John Kinloch*—continued.

1732. Would you be here as a witness to-day for the sake of the public even if it had not been that you were interested as an agriculturist?—If I was asked to come up here as a practical man to stop a fraud I would come at once even if it was not agriculture at all.

1733. Even if it hurt the agricultural interest?—Yes.

1734. You say: "If the effect of marking foreign beef was to lower the price of meat generally it would have the effect of causing less to be imported, as from all statistics we can gather importers could not with any margin of profit sell at lower prices than at present." What statistics are these?—All I hear of the foreign cattle trade is that the margin of profit is very small; the margin between the price at the other end and the price here.

1735. That is just what they say?—It is what we know.

1736. There are statistics, are there?—That is what everyone tells me engaged in the foreign trade, and I have known myself some tremendous heavy losses have been made in it, and I do not know that it has been a very fortunate trade any more than a great many other of those trades.

1737. Then, of course, at Smithfield there is foreign meat sold as home meat, therefore it goes in the retail?—According to the evidence, what we and some other Scotch gentlemen found when we visited Smithfield on Saturday. We were told that the buyers were all so sharp that they did not attempt to pass off anything except as what it was.

1738. It goes out from Smithfield, from what we were told there, in small portions; it may be a small joint?—No, it principally goes off in carcases. Towards Saturday evening they cut it up in that way, but the bulk of the beasts are sold in quantities of 20, or 50, or a hundred sheep at a time.

1739. The evidence that we got at Smithfield was that the great bulk went away cut up in small portions?—We were told when we got there that the stocks were cleared out; they said, "Our wholesale customers have been here."

1740. What strikes us as being very difficult is the marking of these small portions?—I do not know what you were told at Smithfield, but there is no doubt that it is a wholesale market, taking it all round; it is not meant for a retail market.

Mr. *Hozier.*

1741. You are a director of the Highland and Agricultural Society?—Yes.

1742. As you and I know, that is far and away the most important agricultural body in the whole of Scotland?—We reckon it so, and I am sure it is.

1743. A director is a specially important person in connection with the Highland and Agricultural Society?—We are elected by the suffrages of our fellow agriculturists in the various districts.

1744. And on this present occasion you have had the honour paid you as a representative farmer of being asked by the Highland and Agricultural Society, this very important body, to come here and give evidence?—Yes.

Mr. *Hozier*—continued.

1745. And the Highland and Agricultural Society are unanimously in favour of the principle of this Bill?—Yes.

1746. And they are also unanimously opposed to what we call the Birkenhead compromise, which is that foreign cattle killed at Birkenhead and Deptford should be considered British?—Yes; I am glad you have called that by its right name; it is a Birkenhead compromise. I understand from a great deal of information I have gathered, especially since I have come up here, that the opposition to this Bill is from that Birkenhead Trust (or whatever you call it), and it affects them in this way: that all the central butchers in each large town in England want to go to Birkenhead and be able to bring this foreign beef from there. When they got it home they would not say they were selling British, perhaps, but they would not say they were selling American certainly; and the shipping interest is largely interested in it, because they think if they get all this meat dubbed "British" they will get a good deal more of it to carry. That, I believe, is the objection to the Bill.

1747. You know, perhaps, that my name is on the back of this Bill (Mr. Hozier)?—Yes; Lanarkshire.

1748. Are you aware that a good many of the people who support this Bill and who supported it on the second reading agree with the Highland and Agricultural Society that the Bill would be absolutely useless if this compromise was introduced?—I did not know, but I am very glad to hear that some Members of Parliament see through that clause.

1749. You agree with me that this clause makes the Bill worse than useless?—Worse than useless. That I say most certainly. I would rather want the Bill altogether than have it with that clause; I would rather fight the battle as I have been doing.

1750. And as far as protection is concerned, all you want is protection against fraud?—Yes.

1751. For the agriculturist as for everybody else, and for the public?—Yes.

1752. In fact, you want a spade to be called a spade?—Yes, exactly.

1753. At present there is a very considerable difference in price in the wholesale market?—Yes. I was told so this morning since coming into the room by a gentleman here; something like 4*s.* 2*d.* and 2*s.* 8*d.*

1754. As far as your knowledge goes, there is practically no difference in the retail trade?—I hardly grasp your meaning; in regard to the selling of the meat?

1755. Yes?—Well, I understand here in London there are shops that profess to sell nothing but foreign beef, and do sell it at something like its value. Of course they must have a trade profit, but as far as I know the trade in Scotland I really do not think there are very many people that do sell American beef, as American beef.

1756. At an ordinary shop which sells both sorts they do not point out: "This is foreign"?—No, certainly not.

1757. Therefore the result is that the public, as a rule, does not get the benefit of the difference

Mr. *Hozier*—continued.

between the prices?—That is what I want to bring out in my evidence, that the public are being defrauded.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1758. There are only one or two questions I want to ask you. I think the evidence you have given is most complete and most exhaustive. I just want to clear up one point about which I was not quite certain as to your views. I think you said that you considered that the registration, on the whole, was a more important thing, rather than the marking?—Well, if the marking could not be carried out; some people talk of the impracticability of marking, and if it is the fact that it cannot be carried out with reasonable expedition and reasonable expenditure, then I would say that registration is better than nothing.

1759. Of course the leading principle of this Bill really is as to whether meat should be marked?—Yes.

1760. You have been asked yourself a good many questions as to the proposed system of marking?—Yes.

1761. As a practical farmer you are not able to say?—No; I have never been brought into contact with that.

1762. Assuming the difficulties of marking were too great to be carried only, and assuming that even small pieces could not be marked, as has often been suggested, would you consider (I am not doing anything with Clause 15 for the moment) then that the Bill, if it provided simply and solely for registration; that is to say, that a man's business premises should be labelled in a prominent manner as licensing or registering him to sell foreign meat; that then the Bill would be the better?—From my point of view it would be a step in the right direction.

1763. Would it be of more value, do you think, than even the marking?—No; I think the marking would be the most effectual thing.

1764. You think the marking would be the best?—Yes, I do.

1765. Still, you are very emphatic on this one point, that unless Clause 15 is modified in the way proposed you think we should be better without the Bill at all?—Yes; if Clause 15 is enacted, you may as well write the funeral doom over agriculture in Great Britain, because you will ruin the live stock interest of it.

1766. Nobody has asked you any questions about a matter in which I am a good deal interested, that is, the proposal to mark cheese?—My country is not a cheese country at all; there is hardly any made, unless for local consumption. I am not practically acquainted with cheese-making.

1767. Still, as a practical farmer and agriculturist, you might give us your view as to whether you think these considerations about meat apply in the same degree to cheese?—Certainly, and I would think, as far as marking cheese was concerned, it was a much simpler process.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

1768. You have given your evidence very fully and very fairly, and I have not very much to ask. You farm 1,600 acres yourself?—My son and I farm 1,600 acres.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

1769. But you are strongly of opinion that the cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead ought to be branded as foreign meat?—I am strongly of opinion that they all ought to be sold for what they really are.

1770. We had it given in evidence here, I think, by a gentleman of great experience and very high intelligence, that the marking of foreign meat would only tend to advertise it and increase its sale. What is your opinion of that?—Was he a butcher, sir?

1771. I cannot undertake to describe what he is?—It depends altogether on from what point of view he looks at it. I look at it altogether from an agricultural point of view.

1772. I think he is largely engaged in the meat trade, anyway?—Yes, I quite understand that.

1773. You contend that if marking can be carried out in any practicable way at all it ought to be done?—Yes; I just maintain the position that the public ought to get what they buy. I do not care what it is. If the American beef turns out vastly superior and better than ours, let them pay for it.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

1774. You wish the home product to be easily recognisable by the purchaser?—Yes.

1775. Meanwhile, as I understand from your evidence, on the ground of common honesty?—On the ground of common honesty.

1776. And fair dealing between man and man?—Yes; I have the opinion that British breeding and feeding will hold its own if it gets fair play.

1777. I understand from you that you do not gather from your inquiries that the price of British meat would keep up to its present standard?—Yes, I think it would keep it from lowering to an unremunerative level; I think we would manage to hold our own; we would have a try.

1778. I think I understood you to say that the effect of denoting the foreign meat would not be any substantial increase of price to the prejudice of the retail purchaser, in your opinion?—That it would deteriorate the price?

1779. No; that it would not increase the price to the retail purchaser?—No, I do not think it; I think it would have the opposite effect.

1780. Simply would have the effect of giving a man what he asked for?—Yes. In my former evidence I forgot to say that some gentlemen talk about labelling the home beef; if the butchers found that they would put the home label on the foreign beef, and would meet us in that way.

1781. Perhaps you would say, if there is any objection to labelling or marking on the ground of inconvenience and expense, it should be borne by the foreigner and not by the home producer?—Well, I have not considered the question of who should bear it. I do not think there would be very much expense. If it was possible to land it on the foreigner I would certainly let him pay it.

1782. I wanted

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

1782. I wanted to ask you one word with regard to a case mentioned in the proof of your evidence. I think you have stated that further proceedings are going to be taken?—I just quoted that article as I read it.

1783. You quoted the article from the "Mark Lane Express"?—I gave the typewriter the printed copy of the article and he reproduced it.

1784. You know no more of the case?—I know no more of the case further than what is stated.

1785. Therefore it is not you who have been informed that the matter will not rest there; you cannot carry it any further?—No, I know nothing about it, except quoting it as a leading article.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

1786. You were asked something about the price of beef in Glasgow?—Yes.

1787. Of course there are many different qualities of beef?—Yes.

1788. Some are a good deal higher priced than others, naturally?—Yes.

1789. And you naturally think, as a Scotch farmer, that the beef that the Scotch farmers produce is the best?—Yes.

1790. And, as a matter of fact, it commands the highest price in the market?—Yes, it is always quoted the highest.

1791. That is very satisfactory?—Of course, we have different qualities of beef in Scotland as well as in America.

1792. You have old cows and bulls there?—You cannot have live stock without having that, you know.

1793. You were asked, I might mention in connection with that, something about Spanish cattle being sold in this country?—Yes.

1794. But, of course, you are aware that no cattle are allowed to be imported into this country now, except for slaughter at the port of disembarkation?—Yes.

1795. So that if any old cows and bulls and such-like things are sold in the market now they are English?—Yes, of course, they must be.

1796. They cannot be foreign?—No.

1797. And, of course, if they are of low quality they command a low price?—A low price.

1798. And what you desire is, that all beef should be sold according to its quality and according to what it really is at a fair price?—Yes.

1799. I suppose you are acquainted with some of the shops in Glasgow; butchers' shops?—Yes; more, though, in the east of Scotland; but I do know Glasgow.

1800. And in other Scotch towns?—Yes.

1801. Of course, a butcher may sell Scotch beef, and he may sell foreign beef now in the same shop?—Oh, certainly.

1802. But do you think, from your experience, they make a great difference in the price?—I do not think they make any; so far as I know the trade.

1803. So that it is quite possible for a butcher now to buy this cheaper foreign beef and sell it if he can (if his customers are careless enough to buy it) at the Scotch price?—Yes, I know that to be the fact, and I know butchers have made mints of money since the importation of foreign cattle with compulsory slaughter.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

1804. What you wish is, that all beef should command a fair price according to its quality?—Yes, certainly.

1805. You were asked a good deal about the effect this Bill would have, in your opinion, upon prices generally. Of course, this is only one element among many?—Yes.

1806. The price depends upon the market; upon the supply and demand, of course?—Upon the supply and demand.

1807. We all know that; and the price would not depend so much upon whether the meat was marked or not as upon the demand and the supply?—Yes.

1808. So that if you are asked whether you think this Bill will cause a rise or fall in prices it is impossible to answer it?—It is quite impossible; it is a matter of opinion; but my own opinion and the opinion of those whom I represent is this: that if such a Bill or a Bill on these lines is carried out the home-fed beef will hold its own.

1809. Because it is of higher quality than any foreign beef?—Yes, the better class of it is certainly. Some people tell me the people will run to any low-priced thing, but I think there are plenty of people in this country who will consume our beef as home beef at a fair price.

1810. Are there a large body of consumers in the country who like to have thoroughly good beef and pay a fair price for it?—I know that. Since coming to London I was told by a gentleman that in order to be sure to get home beef he dealt with Lord Winchilsea direct; he sent to him through a company he is at the head of although he paid a little more, just to be sure he was eating the home product.

1811. You were asked something about marking Scotch beef. It was suggested to you that it might be a good plan to mark Scotch beef; but Scotch beef is very often labelled now and sold as prime Scotch?—You often see that in the windows, but it may be American for all that.

1812. What you want to bring about is, that it should not be possible to put that label on beef that has merely come from Birkenhead?—Yes.

1813. Then it was suggested to you that this was a measure of protection, and you wanted by means of the enactment of this Bill to raise the price of the home product at the expense of the consumer and to the detriment of the foreign producer?—The word "protection" has got to be a sort of fetish nowadays. I do not want protection, but I want my own article sold really for what it is. That is simple.

1814. No doubt if meat is marked so as not to injure it, if some way could be found of marking meat without injuring it, the foreign beef of equal quality will command about the same price as the corresponding quality of English beef?—Yes, if it is really first class.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

1815. If it is sold according to its quality?—Yes.

1816. So that this is not, in your opinion, a measure of protection in the ordinary sense of the word?—It is a measure of common justice; a measure for the prevention of fraud.

1817. It is to protect the public and the agriculturists against fraudulent practices which are alleged to prevail in the trade?—Yes.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1818. You have been so long in that chair that I am sure I do not want to keep you there very much longer?—I am quite willing.

1819. I think that you represent the Highland and Agricultural Society?—Yes.

1820. I think some questions were put to you by some gentlemen with a sort of idea as to whether you were paid to represent them, but I take it that it is a very high honour that you have been chosen by all the other farmers to represent them, is it not?—Yes, I consider it a high honour.

1821. As high an honour as could possibly be paid to a Scottish farmer?—Yes.

1822. And the Highland Society practically, in Scotland, occupies, I suppose, about the same position as the Royal Agricultural in England?—Yes.

1823. Namely, the first; the Agricultural Society of Scotland?—Yes.

1824. And you have been honoured above all the other farmers in Scotland by being asked to represent them?—Yes, along with Mr. Duthie, of Aberdeenshire.

1825. A good deal of the examination has turned upon the question of the marking of meat. Of course you are aware that this Bill provides for the marking of other things besides?—Yes.

1826. Of cheese and hams (swine meat) as well. I do not think you have been questioned as to any difficulty in regard to those. Does any difficulty suggest itself to your mind?—No. In regard to the marking of beef I see some people have an idea about its damaging beef, but I am perfectly certain the continental methods of marking beef do not damage the beef, and I do not see why it should any more damage it as regards its quality.

1827. Practically, you are of opinion that if almost every country on the Continent are so intellectual that they are able to devise means to mark the meat, our own countrymen are not quite such blockheads as not to be able to do the same thing?—Certainly.

1828. Your society is unanimously in favour of this Bill, with the exception of the 15th clause?—Yes; they are most determinedly opposed to the 15th clause.

1829. But for that they would be unanimously in favour of the Bill?—Yes.

1830. Then some difficulty has been raised with regard to sweetbreads and kidneys. Has it suggested itself to your mind that it might be quite possible to allow them to be imported without attempting to mark, or to pledge the farmer to register who imports them?—That is rather an English question; we do not go in so much for sweetbreads and kidneys in Scotland as they do here.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

1831. You have read the Bill, I suppose, have you?—Oh, yes; I have read the Bill.

1832. I think some question has been put to you as regards the difficulty of marking every little piece of meat; every mutton chop?—Yes.

1833. Can you point to any part of the Bill which says that should be done?—No, I do not think so.

1834. You are aware that in the third clause, which governs the marking, it says that anyone who "sells or exposes for sale, or who hawks or offers for sale, any foreign meat which is not marked on the carcases or sides or hams of the animals, or, in the cases of cheese, on the rind of the same," &c.; it does not say anything about every small mutton chop, does it?—No.

1835. Then a question was put to you as to the marking of English and Scotch meat, and as to whether it would not be just as well (or better, I think, the gentleman who put the question suggested) to mark English or British rather than foreign?—Yes.

1836. Did the danger suggest itself to your mind that if a law was passed making it necessary to mark English, and that all foreign should be unmarked, in that process some of the foreign might get marked as English?—It did not suggest itself at the time.

1837. But does it now?—It has since.

1838. Then that would be making the danger rather greater than it is at present?—Yes.

1839. There is another point as regards the marking of the British and foreign meat. With regard to the suggestion which was made to you that it would be better to mark British than foreign, are you aware of the proportion of the consumption of the two according to the last returns?—No, I cannot say that I am aware exactly.

1840. The proportion is 68 per cent. British, and 32 per cent. foreign?—The foreign is the smaller quantity.

1841. Does it suggest itself to your mind as more economical to mark the 68 or the 32?—Certainly, to mark the smaller quantity.

1842. With regard to the article which you have put in evidence, and handed round, the "Mark Lane" article, I think the question was asked you as to whether butchers do ever sell foreign for English. I forget the answer that you gave; but after reading this article, and probably from other sources of information, have you any doubt on the subject?—I have no doubt whatever that it is done, and done every day.

1843. You have no doubt whatever that foreign meat has been sold by the butchers without any questions being asked, and in many cases has doubtless been bought as English?—I do not know if they said it was English or not; they take the English price; I am quite certain of that.

1844. Now, with regard to the question of registration, I think something was said with regard to a stigma. What is there in your mind which would suggest such a thing as a stigma; do you think it is bad to prefer British over foreign?—I do not think there is any stigma; it is quite honourable to sell foreign beef.

1845. Do you think that this question of

stigma

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

stigma would arise because the British public have any preference for foreign meat?—No.

1846. You think they have for British?—I am told the British public will buy anything that is cheap enough. Before I came here I thought the British had some sort of affection for their own country, but I am told they have none.

1847. You are a Scotchman, and a Scotchman is supposed to be rather canny. Do you believe everything you are told?—No, certainly not, especially since I came to London here.

1848. I was going to give you a little advice, and say when you come to London you must not believe everything you are told?—I am getting up to the wrinkle now, thanks.

Mr. *Brigg.*

1849. May I ask a question with regard to cheese; do you know anything about the dairy work in Scotland?—I have been through the southern counties, Dumfries and Wigton, and these counties, but I am not practically acquainted with cheese-making.

1850. You know there is a large quantity of cheese made there?—Yes, I have been there and seen them stored as high as the roof.

1851. Have you seen in these dairies in Scotland cheeses of different kinds on the shelves, not all one kind or shape?—Oh, no; generally the dairy manufactures a certain class, either one kind or another.

1852. You are not aware that they make cheeses in the shape of Stiltons and Cheddars?—No, I could not enter practically into that question.

1853. You do not know?—No, I do not know from my own knowledge.

Mr. *Doughty.*

1854. There was one point I was not quite clear about, if I might be allowed just to ask it. Did I understand you to say you thought there was very little or no foreign meat sold in Scotland?—Oh, no. York Hill, Glasgow, is the only port, and I believe 1,500 to 2,000 is the weekly supply of American cattle there.

1855. That is live cattle?—In the old times we used to have about 1,700 to 2,000 home cattle in Glasgow every Wednesday; now when we have more than 500 the market is overstocked, and that is brought about by the fact that we have always 1,500 to 2,000 foreign cattle.

1856. I see; that alters the position. The greater proportion of these cattle are cattle distributed about Scotland, you think?—It is principally in Glasgow, but it goes outside; but the home cattle

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

that used to come to Glasgow are far more consumed in the country now, because they are not needed in the centre.

1857. Now one word about these dishonest butchers you are talking about?—I do not say they are dishonest; I say if they get in American beef and a person comes and buys it they do not say it is British, perhaps, but they charge British prices.

1858. Then there are as many honest men among butchers as there are among farmers?—I do not know; I am inclined to think the farmer the better specimen of humanity, but I may be wrong. I know some very very worthy butchers.

Chairman.

1859. Just one point. You have had a very long morning of it. I take it from your evidence to Mr. Smith and other members of the Committee that the quality of the meat, and not the place of origin, is the main factor in the price?—It is one factor; well, it is the main factor; but, at the same time, I want to clear myself with the idea that the Scotch beef, if it were really known we were getting it, would be preferred by a considerable portion of our consuming public.

1860. I think you said, in answer to a question from Mr. Smith, that the low quality of meat would always affect the price?—Of course, inferior beef, come from where it will, will always fetch an inferior price.

1861. Then the fact of marking an inferior Argentine beast as British would really not raise the price of that inferior beast?—I think if you marked it "Argentine beef" you might as well put it down the Thames at once. I do not think it is worth very much, to begin with.

1862. That is not an answer to my question. The place of origin does not affect the price so much as the quality, does it?—Certainly not.

1863. The fact of marking one of those would not send the price of it up?—They might take a tit-bit of roast or the sweetbread out of it and label it as "British," and sell at a long price.

1864. Would the consumer be willing to give more for it?—I do not know, if he came to these kidneys and sweetbreads that are so much spoken about, that he could tell whether they came out of an Argentine bullock or not.

1865. You have told us you do not know anything about kidneys and sweetbreads?—We do not consume them so largely in Scotland as you do in England.

Mr. EDMOND HILL, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Chairman.

1866. YOU are senior partner in the firm of Hill Brothers, Evercreech, Somerset?—Yes.

1867. You are a cheese factor?—Yes.

1868. Your sales average 1,600 tons annually, excepting the last two years?—Yes. I would also observe I am a member of our Somerset County Council as well. I do not know whether that has anything to do with my evidence.

Chairman—continued.

1869. You are a member of the Somerset County Council?—Yes.

1870. Your sales averaged 1,600 tons annually until the last two years, when, in consequence of the drought and short make, they were about 200 tons less?—Yes.

1871. You sell to large buyers in the country?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

1872. The business has been in existence nearly 100 years in your family?—Yes.

1873. Are Canadian and American factory cheese made up in shape to resemble the English Cheddar?—They are.

1874. And do the retailers try to palm those off to the detriment of the home make?—They do in a great number of cases, in the majority, more than the majority, I should think two-thirds of the retailers.

1875. English Cheddar commands a better price than American cheese?—Yes, it does. The wholesale price of new Cheddar at the present time is about 64; the wholesale price of Canadian and American is about 40 and 42, which is more than a third less, and it is the interest of these retailers to push that which they get the most profit on by palming it off on the public, which they do.

1876. I see you say nearly all large hotels and restaurants, you think, are obliged to keep Cheddar?—They do; they say so. The chief hotels and chief restaurants are obliged to keep Cheddar cheese, because they cannot make a Welsh rarebit from this Canadian or American cheese. You will find, if you inquire from everyone, the same. They dare not make it, because if they did the person eating it would have no sleep or rest after it.

1877. Do you mean it is so indigestible when toasted?—It is so indigestible.

1878. And there is a difference in the look of it, is there?—There is a difference in the look of it; in this Canadian and American factory cheese the oil would go in one place and the curd would burn up in a sort of piece of leather, quite separate; it would not go together or spread over like a piece of jelly, or anything of the kind. One would be like a piece of leather; the other would be like oil.

1879. You think the English cheese makers ought to be protected against the sale of American cheese for English?—Most certainly; and I have a letter from Mr. Livesey, of Preston, a large cheese merchant, who heard I was giving evidence. He wrote in letter to say he hoped something would be done, because in Lancashire they were subjected to considerable annoyance by having this American cheese palmed off as their own country cheese; therefore they are anxious to have it marked.

1880. May I ask you how the law stands with regard to that now?—If a tradesman sold American cheese as English cheese would he not be liable under the Adulteration Act?—Oh, no, certainly not; he would call it "the Cheddar."

1881. If he called it "English Cheddar" he would be liable, I suppose?—I daresay if he called it the "English Cheddar," but they do not; they call it the "Canadian Cheddar" or the "Cheddar." I will tell you the effect: I have just been out in New South Wales; here is a paper in which they describe Cheddar. Cheddar will become a misnomer in course of time; instead of being famous it will be of no account whatever.

1882. I see this is an advertisement of the New South Wales Creamery and Butter Company, in which they bring under the notice of their customers the fact that they are now making at their factory at Cobargo Cheddar cheese of very superior quality equal to the best New Zealand?—Yes.

1883. The "Stock and Station Journal" says "we find it equal to New Zealand Cheddar and the white Cheddar from Hawkesbury Agricultural College, Richmond?—I do not know whether I am in order in mentioning (it is not mentioned in my statement to you) that they have nearly as many cattle in Queensland and New South Wales as they have in Great Britain or in the United Kingdom; and now they are setting up these dairies in all directions (you have a sample there), and they are making this cheese and describing it as Cheddar. I do not object to their making it at all, but what I do object to is their palming it off as English Cheddar, as is done when it arrives here. My evidence is for marking "This cheese is Australian" or "New Zealand" or "American," which could be easily done. I suppose all you gentlemen know a cheese. There is the cheese all round and there is the top. They can have "Australian" marked twice, across the top and in the bottom, the letters; and those letters would push into the cheese like a pressure on here (*describing*) precisely, and it would be visible for everyone to see when they went to buy.

1884. You said just now they sometimes sold this cheese as Canadian Cheddar?—Yes.

1885. If they sell it as Canadian Cheddar there is no fraud then, is there?—Oh, yes, because I do not think it is Cheddar at all; it is Canadian. They have no right to sell York hams; why should not they sell York hams as well as Cheddar?

1886. Can you tell me (I do not know) has there ever been any decision in the courts as to whether the name of an article may be used for any article of a similar nature, or whether it must be confined to cheese made in Cheddar?—I do not say confined to cheese made in Cheddar, but it is made famous by the English manufacture. They make cheese in Scotland and describe it as "Cheddar."

1887. There are many similar names used which originally applied to a place, but which come to be used simply as adjectives to describe the article?—Oh, yes.

1888. For instance, when one is talking about champagne it does not follow that it comes from the Champagne district; a great deal of it does not?—Yes.

1889. You have recently returned from a journey round the world?—I have.

1890. You took the opportunity of observing the dairy industry in the Australian Colonies and New Zealand?—I did.

1891. The milk in Australia is 2*d.* per gallon, and in New Zealand 2½*d.*?—Yes.

1892. The pasturage and temperature are not as good for making a fine quality of cheese?—Certainly not.

1893. Do you mean it is impossible there to make a fine quality of cheese?—Certainly; they could not do so; it is absurd to expect it. The same applies also in America and Canada. The dairies are small, and mixing up such immense quantities

Chairman—continued.

quantities of milk together it is impossible they can do it. Factories do not succeed in this country at all.

1894. You visited some cheese factories in New Zealand?—I did.

1895. And you say it would be a miracle for a maker to have a palatable cheese under such conditions?—Certainly.

1896. Will you kindly describe the conditions?—In this case there were 1,200 gallons of milk, and this was brought from 56 different farmers, which would be about an average of 24 gallons for each farmer; and it is impossible for any man, no matter how clever he may be, to make a fine palatable cheese out of such different kinds of milk, and brought such distances as that was. Then I examined the curd, and it was very inferior, and had a very disagreeable smell. I know it from the practice of making cheese myself.

1897. The same condition, you say, applies to Canadian and American?—Canadian and American.

1898. Have you had an opportunity of seeing the Canadian and American systems too?—I have seen the Canadian. I have been through America a good deal, but I have not troubled to go through any of their dairies; but it is just the same as it is in this place, because these are copies of the Americans, what they have in New Zealand, the whole machine, and everything that is put up.

1899. New Zealand and Australia have simply copied the system of America?—Yes.

1900. I believe the Jews insist upon having a special cheese specially made?—The Jews, for making their cheese in Holland, and also in England, have an expert sent to see that the cows are all healthy, and that the surroundings are beautifully clean. Then this cheese is made, and then the Jews put their brand on the cheese and brand it as their make; therefore I say if Canadian and American were branded the same we should all know what we were buying.

1901. In New Zealand the purveyors who do the best trade you say import Dunlop and Stilton?—They do, and sell it at a very high price; and also bacon and hams they have over from England, and sell at a very high price, and have a good sale for them.

1902. May I ask what your point is in mentioning that?—My object in mentioning that is as showing that their own quality is not in their own country to be compared with the goods that are made in this country.

1903. I take it that you are in agreement with the last witness as to the question of meat marking?—Most certainly, I am in that respect.

1904. I take it you are in favour of marking all meat?—Certainly, and it can be done with great ease.

1905. Mutton or lamb, or whether it is killed at the port of disembarkation, or imported frozen or not, you would like it all to be marked?—Most certainly.

1906. But you come here not as an authority on meat marking?—No, except as having been in Australia and New Zealand, and seeing the meat out there, and finding the difference in the

Chairman—continued.

beef and mutton in this country. As I was asked to give evidence on the matter of cheese, I thought I would make that remark, and I mentioned about the lamb. The lamb out there is very nice (the New Zealand lamb) indeed; simply because this lamb is bred from the milk of the other; it is the food they have that makes the food superior.

1907. Is it for the protection of the consumer or of the retailer that you desire to see cheese marked?—I do it both for the consumer and buyer, and also the producer in this country.

1908. Is there any harm done to the buyer if he knows that he is buying foreign cheese; is any harm occasioned to him by having that cheese marked "Cheddar" or "Stilton," or whatever the mark may be?—There is; he is deceived there in that respect.

1909. He is not taught to believe that that cheese is actually made in the Cheddar district, is he?—I admit that; but there are hundreds of shops throughout the United Kingdom that sell this cheese and sell it for cheddar, and they have not got a cheddar in their place.

1910. You think it would be quite easy to mark this foreign cheese?—Most certainly, without any hardship to the factory maker, and with a very little cost. They could put the brand on the top crossways, and the same on the bottom of the vat.

1911. You would like that to be done at every factory?—At every factory. It would be in the vat; the letters would be projecting up in the vat, and all they would have to do would be to put the curd into the vat, and this "follower," as they term it, comes on the top and that presses on this curd, and there are the letters always marking the cheese; they could never get it out unless they plastered it up: they could not do so unless they broke the cheese up again.

1912. Do you think the producer in this country would get a higher price for his cheese if this were passed?—He would get a more uniform price; there would be a better demand. If you or any gentleman wanted cheddar, he would have it because it is superior. My view is that with this cheese of the American and Canadian, and now this New Zealand and Australian that they all call cheddar, they will not ask for cheddar at all, and cheddar will become the worst class of cheese that is supplied instead of being the best.

1913. Could not you avoid that by marking yours "English Cheddar"?—They could mark theirs "English Cheddar."

1914. Would you have any objection to yours being marked "English Cheddar"?—There is no prevention for their adopting the mark of "English Cheddar."

1915. Provided that they were not allowed; they would not be allowed, I think, under the Merchandise Marks Act?—They might mark it "New Zealand Cheddar," or any other cheddar.

1916. Even now, if they give the designation of "English" to an article manufactured abroad, they come under the Merchandise Marks Act?—I grant you all that, sir; but it would be a very great shame for our people to be obliged to mark theirs, to compel them to do it.

Chairman—continued.

1917. I want to know why, if it is so easy to do it at a factory?—These factories are large factories; they have a lot of machinery and everything there; and it is only for them to get these letters and fix them on their vats.

1918. Could not an English farmer do that, or specify even the farm from which it came, if his article is so much superior?—He could do that, I grant you, but I do not think it would be wise at all.

1919. If he is producing a superior article it could not do it any harm to know from where it came?—I do not know that it would do it any harm, but it would be a lot of unnecessary trouble for these men.

1920. I suppose anybody buying this cheddar, which you say is inferior and more indigestible than our own cheddar, buying it and eating it, could be deceived into thinking it was our own?—They are continually. Only last Sunday one of the members of the firm, when the Committee inspected, went to inspect the bacon where the branding was; he was at an hotel at Shepperton, and he said he wanted cheddar, and they brought Canadian cheese for cheddar. Now, only last Tuesday week I met a friend of mine, a factor; he was at the "Holborn Restaurant," that big place; he had luncheon there; everything was very fair and honest until the cheese came on; and then they brought on this American cheese for cheddar; therefore he considered he was swindled, and told them so, and he brought the manager up.

1921. He told them so?—He told them so, and they apologised. Then he told them he was in the business; and I have had to complain myself.

1922. Did they deny that it was American cheddar?—At first they said it was cheddar. Of course they were asked for cheddar, and if they bring in this "Canadian cheddar" when you ask for "cheddar," why they are then serving cheddar. If they got it marked "Canadian" it would pass in its own currency.

1923. You would like the word "cheddar" confined as a trade mark to English cheddar cheese?—All I want is that this cheese from every country that is imported should be branded with the country from where it comes. They can call it whatever they like: Stilton, Leicester, Derby, or Cheshire.

1924. Or cheddar?—Or cheddar, or whatever they like; but there it is stamped on each cheese, the place of its production. That is all I want, and that is all our country people want; the honest retailers only want that.

1925. Is it ever done now; is a foreign cheese ever sent with the country of origin stamped upon it?—Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

1926. Practically, you would agree, I think, with what Mr. Primrose, the Customs officer, said: that if cheese come into this country called cheddar, it should be marked "American cheddar"?—Well, I do not exactly agree with that. If you, or any gentleman at an hotel or restaurant, were in want of cheddar, you would have it brought you; you would expect cheddar; you would not ask for American

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

cheddar; you would not have the American or Canadian cheddar, but "the cheddar," you understand, would be the cheddar that is made in England, the home manufacture. Just going from that, they make cheddar loaves, and these loaves now are used for ships' stores. The American people thought they could make a cheddar loaf as well, and they did make it, and the loaves came, and were wholly useless; they would not keep; they were not suitable. They were made in the shape of a round cheddar loaf, but they were of no use at all. No shipper would ever ship them or use such cheese as that American loaf which they wanted to palm off, therefore they abandoned the trade altogether; the shippers could not sell them.

1927. Then, I take it, to prevent the public being deceived, and prevent this term "cheddar" (which the Customs authorities have held denotes only an English cheese) being applied to foreign-made cheese, the best way would be to mark all foreign cheese that comes into this country "foreign"?—To mark the country of its production. It is really no great hardship at all to do so.

1928. I think a question was put to you about cheesemakers being protected. I think you said so; but it is also, of course, your opinion that the consumer ought to be protected?—Most certainly.

1929. Then we come to the question of prices. The way in which the present system would affect the consumer, I suppose, would be something in this way, would it not: that if he went to a shop and asked for cheddar, and were supplied with American or Canadian cheddar at (say) 7*d.* or 8*d.* a pound, he would be paying at the rate of 42*s.* per cwt., considerably more than the fair profit retail price, and also he would be paying, would not he, less than the price for which he could get good English cheddar?—Yes, he would.

1930. Would not the effect of that be to rather deceive or cheat the consumer. He gets an inferior article and pays more than he would have to do if it was known to be foreign?—Exactly.

1931. And does not it also affect the sale of the English producer by competing unfairly against his article?—Yes, that is my point.

1932. Your point is that you do not want protection for the producer, or the cheesemaker as we might call it, spelled with a big "P," but you want protection from unfair competition?—I want protection against deception; that is the secret of it.

1933. That is the point?—Yes it is, both to the seller and the buyer, and it brings the genuine article into bad odour.

1934. You said you had travelled a good deal in the colonies, Australia and New Zealand?—Yes.

1935. Is it your opinion that they would object very largely to this marking?—Oh, no, not at all; I know the New Zealand people would be only too glad to have their meat marked, meat I am speaking of in particular, or even this cheese, for they contemplate building what they call a New Zealand market near the

home

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

home market, so that their home produce should come here; therefore, if they get this mark put on their meat and cheese at the place of its production, when it comes here it is open to the eyes of the British public to see what they are buying.

1936. With reference to meat, as you have mentioned that too, I think you had some conversation with some of the colonials when you were out there upon the question of meat and frozen meat?—I had.

1937. Could you kindly give the Committee your view about that?—I asked several of the chief butchers how it was that the lamb was so palatable and like English; of course you can cook lamb immediately it is killed, but it does not make any difference, you do not want to hang it. They said, the other is obliged to be cooked so quickly. I said, Why do not you put it into your cold chamber then, and let it be chilled and get tender?" And they said directly, "Oh, that would destroy the goodness of it, the nutritious properties of it;" that is their statement to me, it would have a deleterious effect.

1938. That is the statement of the people who have to deal with it?—Yes, the people who kill it out there.

1939. That is the opinion of the colonials themselves?—Of the colonials themselves.

1940. That they very much prefer fresh meat that has not been to these chilled chambers at all?—Yes.

1941. In fact, they are of opinion that it has a deleterious effect, and is not as good as the fresh meat?—Certainly.

1942. With respect to the marking, I think you told us that Jews did it in regard to cheese?—They do; they mark their cheese.

1943. Of course, we know they mark their meat too?—Yes.

1944. That mark is considered sufficient in their case, is it not?—Oh, certainly.

1945. Sufficient for them?—Yes.

1946. Then I think you were asked why we should not mark English and let the foreign come in free; is it your opinion that any such question as forcing small struggling farmers in these days to add to their machinery, and buy machines to have to mark, in these days of agricultural depression, that a measure of that sort would be particularly popular in the country?—I think it would be very cruel to compel them to do so.

1947. What would you give for my seat or that of any other agricultural member's seat, who proposed such a proposition as that?—I do not think he would get returned again, because of the public interference.

1948. With reference to the amount of trade, we know there is very much more cheese produced in this country and sold than what is brought in?—Exactly.

1949. Would it be fair or just to oblige our own home producers to mark the cheese rather than to mark the foreign?—It would be very unjust, I think myself.

1950. Those are the two principal reasons which would militate against marking English and letting the foreign come in free?— Oh, yes.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

1951. Then, I take it, in your opinion there would be a feeling of great unfairness in bringing any compulsory marking to take effect only upon our home producer. You say in your opinion it would be most unfair to do it?—Most unfair to make them mark.

1952. Especially as they have got to compete against the whole world and cheap labour?—Yes; I think it would be great cruelty to make them do so.

1953. But you cannot see, can you, any difficulties with regard to making the foreigner mark his?—Certainly not.

1954. Especially as he is allowed to come in free to the best market in the world, and to compete with ourselves?—Exactly.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

1955. Where does the bulk of this cheese come from?—At present the great bulk comes rather more from Canada, I think, than from the States; formerly the chief import was from the States.

1956. But what you have personal knowledge of comes from the Australian colonies?—Oh, no; I know Canada and the States as well. I have been to Canada before now.

1957. It may be my mistake. I did not understand that from your former evidence. You can speak from personal knowledge both of the Canadian, the Transatlantic, and the Australian cheese?—Yes, certainly.

1958. And they are both of inferior quality?—Most certainly they are. I have bought thousands and tens of thousands on speculation and sold them again.

1959. They are cheeses that will not make Welsh rarebits?—They will not make Welsh rarebits.

1960. And they will not keep sufficiently for the purposes of a sea voyage?—They will not, certainly not.

1961. Will you please tell us what other effects they possess?—They are certainly not pleasant to the taste, neither are they good for the digestion. You yourself, or anyone, if they had luncheon or dinner and a little of this cheese to eat afterwards, would find a very disagreeable taste.

1962. Not so palatable?—No.

1963. Not so digestible?—No.

1964. They have not as high a food value?—No, I have been in shops waiting to speak to the customer, and children have been standing round, and I have given them a little bit of English cheese that has been on the counter, and the little children will look up, sort of wishing for more. I give them a bit of American, they screw up their faces and spit it out directly; a child will discover that there is a difference.

1965. Then it is neither as palatable nor as nutritious?— Nor as nutritious, that is my opinion.

1966. Yet it is bought?—Well, it is bought because it is pushed on the public.

1967. It is bought to a substantial and serious extent?—Yes.

1968. And it is supplied to purchasers who wish for English?—Who wish for English.

 1969. And

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

1969. And it is supplied as English?—And it is supplied as English and ticketed as Cheddar cheese.

1970. As Cheddar cheese?—As Cheddar cheese; not a word said about its being foreign.

1971. Now follow that out; this cheese is made up in a form to imitate (I do not use the word in any offensive sense) the English product?—Exactly.

1972. And it is put upon the market without anything to distinguish where it comes from?—Exactly; that is the cheese itself. On the box which contains the cheese there is printed the name, but then when it is out of the box the name is not visible at all.

1973. When it gets into the retail market then there is nothing to indicate its domicile of origin?—No, nothing whatever.

1974. And it is decidedly an inferior article?—Most decidedly.

1975. And I presume the purchaser has to pay the same price for it as for the English?—He pays more than he ought to pay, oftentimes through its being palmed off as English.

1976. He pays the English price for the less valuable foreign product?—Exactly.

1977. And you would have all foreign-made cheese marked, with a view of protecting him from what is really a form of imposition?—Exactly.

1978. Would you go a little further and tell me why his own palate or his own digestion will not suffice to identify what it is?—Just like you if you went to an hotel or went to any place and called for Cheddar cheese: they would bring that; you would not think but what you were served honestly; but I should know, of course, being in the trade, and so would anyone of great experience, but you would know very well that the cheese with which you were served for Cheddar was not a nice palatable cheese; at the same time you would not be able to declare that it was American or Canadian.

1979. But your point is that for the protection of the purchaser, for the protection of the consumer, it is absolutely necessary that this foreign article should have its place of origin indicated upon it?—Exactly.

1980. And that, for the protection of the consumers who gets an inferior article at a higher price, rather than for the protection of the English producer whose cheese will always command a market?—It is for the protection of both, as much one as the other, I look upon both the consumer and producer, and say that that they should not either of them be deceived.

1981. Do I understand you to say that one result of marking foreign cheese would be that you would get a better price for the English?—Well, there would be a better demand for it and a more regular price.

1982. A better demand and a steadier price?—And a steadier price.

1983. I ask you that, because a former witness has stated much the same with regard to meat; I want to put it to you clearly this way: It would not to any substantial extent increase the cost to the consumer, but it would steady the trade and would make an increased demand?—Exactly.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

1984. And in that way would benefit the English producer without prejudicing the English consumer?—Certainly; the only person who would suffer would be the shopkeeper who palms off the cheaper cost article for the higher cost.

1985. The person who at the present time purchases the inferior article at the price of the inferior article and retails it at the price of the superior article?—Exactly.

1986. He would be the sufferer?—He would be the sufferer. Those are the people I want to touch.

Chairman.

1987. The retailer is never deceived, is he, himself?—He would not be deceived, not the retailer, certainly.

1988. It is always marked when it comes to him?—He has it in the box; then he takes it out of the box and takes off the cloth and then he often sells it, of course, as "the Cheddar."

Mr. *MacAleese.*

1989. I take it your chief objection to this foreign cheese is that it makes bad Welsh rarebits?—That is one thing. These men know that from experience; I know because I have had to deal with cheese almost all my lifetime.

1990. Very like leather I understand you to say?—Yes.

1991. Leather is not a desirable article?—Certainly not to get in your stomach.

1992. Do you think marking or branding would remedy this to some extent?—The branding would. I do not know whether it would affect that in particular; they would not make it; they do not make it now; they cannot because it is inferior.

1993. A purchaser going into a shop would see that cheese marked "Canadian Cheddar"?—"Canadian."

1994. Canadian or American cheese, would not he buy it?—I do not object to his buying it.

1995. All the same, you think the article should be marked in the way you suggest?—I do, and I think everybody else would say the same if they had to buy it.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

1996. I should like you to amplify your answer a little bit about what you were saying in the earlier part of your evidence, about going round these cheese manufactories in New Zealand and Australia; you dwelt upon the fact rather that the mixing of the milk is a bad thing for the manufacture of the cheese?—Most certainly it is, in small dairies like that.

1997. I should like to carry your answer a little bit further for the Committee. Cheddar itself is a district, is it not?—It is; a good deal arises from the temperature. A good part of Dorsetshire, a large portion of Wiltshire, but not so very much, and nearly the whole county of Somerset, is where the best Cheddar cheese is made.

1998. It is all called Cheddar?—Wiltshire Cheddar cheese is not so good, and has a special name.

1999. Of course there is a specific Wiltshire cheese as well?—Yes.

2000. I suppose

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

2000. I suppose you are of opinion that just as you have described in the case of New Zealand, so isolated farms themselves very often differ very much at home in the quality of cheese they produce?—Oh, yes; it would be so, if they made it up in their own houses.

2001. Even if made in the farms themselves? Yes.

2002. Do you find in the Cheddar cheese-making district that there may be two farmers not very far removed from each other, that they may be both equally skilful in the manufacture of their cheese, and it may be made in the same way precisely, and under the same conditions of temperature, and yet that the cheese produced at one farm may very often vary very considerably in quality from that produced at the other farm?—I do, most certainly, from experience.

2003. And that, therefore, there is something which probably is inherent in the pasture?—No, it is not that; it is through some mistake of the maker.

2004. I am assuming both farmers are equally capable?—They may be equally capable, but there is some mistake. In connection with the Somersetshire County Council they have a school, and this school goes from district to district. Last year they went to near Bridgwater, which is known for making very inferior cheese in the district, and there they made splendid cheese. I gave a very high price for this cheese that was made after the instruction given; and the pupils who go there and learn and who are skilful. pupils turn out very fine cheese indeed; but then there are great numbers who cannot learn anything when they come and try to learn, either dairy work or any other work.

2005. Exactly. Then if the difference of the cheese lies in the way in which it is made and not in the milk, why does the mixing of the milk on your New Zealand farms render it impossible to produce a good cheese?—Because of what takes place in our own English factories. They have one at Gillingham where they always have 1,200 to 1,500 gallons of milk, and they tried to make cheese there; and at Wincanton, at Berkeley Vale, the late Lord Fitzhardinge went to great expense in setting up a factory there, and it turned out a failure. Where a lot of milk is brought together they cannot make fine cheese.

2006. I quite agree with what you say as the result, but what I do not understand, and what I want the Committee to understand a little more, is as to the reason why the New Zealand and Australian people cannot produce this good cheese which you said in the preliminary portion of your evidence was due to the fact that the milk was mixed; that it came from so many farms?—Different pasturages and different temperatures. Milk is an extraordinary thing. A pint of milk, it is said by the chemists, who know so much (I cannot tell), but they say in a pint of milk there are 20 million separate little globules, so you can easily understand, with a body of milk being brought together to mix up, how any dairy person cannot make a fine cheese.

2007. Why cannot they make cheese in Devonshire?—I suppose they have not got any knowledge for it and it does not suit them.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

2008. Is it not because the amount of caseine in the milk varies very much from that of Somersetshire?—Yes, there is more butter in some soils.

2009. Might not that be the case with Australia and New Zealand and all these mixed farms?—I can only tell you from my own practical knowledge of factories in England that they are all more or less a failure.

2010. That is a little foreign to the subject?—Therefore I say it is very unfair that these factory cheeses should come over here; they ought to be branded with the country from which they come.

2011. Not because they are factory made, but because they come from a foreign country?—I do not say because they come actually from a foreign or a colonial district, but simply to show the place of origin.

Mr. *Brigg.*

2012. May I ask some questions a little different from those you have been replying to? First of all, I will ask you a plain question. Do you believe the wholesale buyers of cheese (I am speaking now of wholesale grocers who buy large quantities of American and Canadian Cheddar, and of other kinds of cheese); do you suppose those wholesale buyers of cheese are ever deceived in the quality of the article they buy?—No, certainly not.

2013. They are not deceived?—No.

2014. Consequently there is no reason on their account that the cheese should be marked in any way otherwise than it is marked at present?—It is marked at present; they do it; on the box it is mentioned.

2015. Then, may I ask you with regard to marking it for retail purposes (although that is not part of our Bill), have you any idea that it could be marked in any way so that retail shopkeepers, or rather retail buyers, might be able to detect the kind of cheese they were buying as to the origin, and where it came from?—Most certainly. I have mentioned, by stamping letters into the crown (that is in the top of the cheese), and the bottom of the cheese; there it would be shown both sides.

2016. I am saying the retail buyer, the buyer of a half-a-pound of cheese or a pound of cheese?—He could see where it was cut off from, and he could see just where it was made.

2017.—You think that mark would be quite sufficient?—Quite sufficient.

2018. It is your opinion that that mark would be sufficient?—It is my opinion that that mark would be sufficient.

2019. Now I want to ask another thing that is a little aside. In your business do you ever find that cheeses from other parts of England or Scotland are sold as Cheddar cheese in the markets where you supply?—There is a great deal sold in London (or some); it is not in very good esteem, the Scotch Cheddar. There is a certain amount of Scotch Cheddar, but the large best retailers will not have it for Scotch Cheddar.

2020. There is a Scotch Cheddar?—There is a Scotch Cheddar.

2021. Would you recommend or advise that this

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

this Bill should introduce clauses for the purpose of marking Scotch Cheddar?—Certainly not.

2022. You consider that competition not injurious to you?—Not injurious; most assuredly.

2023. You have spoken of this and other kinds of cheese, but are you aware that in other dairies there are cheeses made in England which in all respects represent foreign cheese (Gruyere, Camembert, Gorgonzola, and so on)?—Yes, I am aware.

2024. Then this cheese would be in England unmarked?—Yes.

2025. And would you desire any mark to be employed in reference to this cheese, or let that take its chance in the market the same way as foreign cheese?—The quantity that comes in is so infinitesimal that I do not think it would be worth the trouble.

2026. It is a fact that they are made?—Yes.

2027. And the quantity of foreign cheeses as we call them that are being made in England is distinctly increasing?—Those particular fancy cheeses.

2028. "Fancy cheeses," that is what you call it; and it is one of the objects of the technical instruction class and the dairy generally to introduce the making of what you call "fancy cheese" in England, whereby the farmer may obtain a better price for his material?—Yes.

2029. You would not recommend that those cheeses should be marked at all?—Because the quantity is so very very small, and they are so unprofitable to make.

2030. Do I understand you to say you would not recommend the foreign cheeses to be marked?—The quantity that comes in is so infinitesimal that it would be hardly worth while to mark it.

Chairman.

2031. The quantity of Gruyere, Gorgonzola, and Dutch cheese; is that so infinitesimal?——There is a good deal comes from Holland. It would be favouring, perhaps, one country at the expense of another, and it might cause a little feeling, but there would be no harm, for certainly the Dutch, and even the French people too, have impressed upon the crown of the cheese when pressed down the name of the nation.

Mr. *Brigg.*

2032. I am rather pointing in another direction. As regards these farmers, who are being encouraged in the making of these (what you call) "fancy cheeses," and by means of which we hope they will make money, (they put these cheeses upon the market); I want to know whether you ask that those cheeses should be marked in any way as English, or with any mark at all?—I would not make them mark them at all.

2033. Alongside of that, I ask whether you do not wish clearly that foreign cheeses of all kinds and sorts should be marked when they are imported into this country?—I do; but then I do not see really the necessity.

2034. Then I may point out this difficulty: you are marking cheeses which came from abroad into England and then you have English cheeses in the plain, which are not marked, then both cheeses go to the same shop, the same dealer, and how are you to detect for the purpose of punishing that dealer whether he is selling the one or the other?—I do not say that I should make any exception. You could mark cheese Roquefort on cheese Gruyere or Dutch as well as you could the other; both of them could be marked.

2035. I am very glad to hear you say that in Somersetshire they have very much improved the make of cheese?—Yes.

2036. You were speaking about a variety of cheeses and the differences between one kind of cheese and another even in the same locality. I suppose you are aware of something about the power or the effect of the microbes which are supposed to be the active agency employed in making the different kinds of cheese?—The best makers do not employ any foreign substance.

2037. That is quite true, but they are content with the microbes on their own premises; that is really the fact?—Yes.

2038. I was rather surprised to hear that you did not advise or recommend that farmers who make an excellent quality of cheese should put on their own mark. You did not advise that a farmer or a dairy which makes a good quality of cheese should put on their own distinctive mark?—Well, I do not advise it.

2039. You do not advise it?—Certainly not.

2040. Then I suppose practically you are a dealer in cheese?—I am; I have a lot of land of my own, and farm that and make cheese.

2041. You are a larger dealer than you are producer?—Yes.

2042. I suppose we may infer naturally from our knowledge of commercial matters generally that it would not suit your purpose as a dealer to have these cheeses handed into you from dairies with with their respective marks upon them; otherwise the buyer would go over your head and buy direct from the farmer instead of from you?—We are, of course, factors, and we sell the produce of the whole of the dairies equally.

2043. You say you do not encourage the farmer to put a mark on his cheese whereby the buyer can distinguish that from other cheddar cheese you sell?—I do very often tell large retailers, and wholesale too, whose dairy it is; they invariably wish to know it and I give the name of the dairy. I only get my fair commission out of them, and they know that very well.

2044. You work that on your commission and run the risk of their going over your head?—Certainly, because they would not do that kind of thing.

2045. It seems that the object of the teaching of dairy schools is to encourage these respective dairies and farmers to get a rate of excellence for themselves whereby they would attain a position in the market which they have to supply?—Yes.

2046. Of course if they did it they would be able to go through you with the commission or to go over your head?—As a rule the large wholesale buyer buys the goods on inspection irrespective of any particular dairy; the dairy may be an excellent dairy this year, and next year it may be no good.

2047. I have

Mr. *Doughty.*

2047. I have not many questions to ask you, but are you a cheese factor or a scientific cheese maker?—Cheese factor is my *rôle.*

2048. Do you profess to have a scientific knowledge of cheese making?—They make the cheese at the dairy school from instructions I have given them.

2049. Do you consider yourself an authority on cheese making?—I do; I should, certainly.

2050. I think you told us a little while ago that in Queensland and New South Wales, abroad generally, they cannot make the finest quality of cheese?—They cannot, because they have not the pasturage or the temperature for making it; it is utterly impossible for them to do it.

2051. It is impossible for them to make the finest quality of cheese?—Certainly.

2052. Why is it impossible?—The milk would get tainted before it could be made up. That is how it is with the New Zealand and with the American and Canadian in a great measure.

2053. The milk gets tainted before it is made up?—Yes.

2054. Why should that be?—If you ask any of the large importers they will tell you that these dairies are small, and that they have to go a long distance for the delivery of this milk, and containing so many actual organisms as the milk does, it undergoes a certain amount of putrefaction or fermentation of some sort, and the whole thing is completely changed.

2055. You will not be aware, I presume, that one of the largest factors in London told me the other day that he has some cheddar cheese from America, which is superior in quality to most English cheddar cheese?—Would you mind giving the name of the factor, sir.

2056. I will give you the name privately, certainly. Now, I want to ask you, whether it is not possible for you to be deceived on this question?—In the cheese do you mean?

2057. In the quality of the cheese?—Oh, no; not at all.

2058. Then if there is this great difference between English cheddar and foreign cheddar cheese—— ?—"Foreign cheese," I should rather say, not "foreign cheddar."

2059. Well, "foreign cheese"; it is always cheddar. If there is this great difference to which you refer, do you think the public generally are not capable of finding it out?—They do not find it out. I have just mentioned the experience of a gentleman at the Holborn Restaurant last week (last Sunday). I could bring hundreds of places where people palm off the American as English. You would not know, not being an expert in the business, no more would any gentleman around this table, I daresay, be able to distinguish; you would know it was not good, but you would not know whether it was cheddar.

2060. Say the middle class people, who, I suppose, eat as much cheese as any other section of the community, do you think they care one straw whether the cheese is made in England or America?—They do not care so long as it is good, but they want a nice agreeable cheese, and they know they can get it if they get the real cheddar itself, but if they get American they are deceived.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

2061. I understood when you referred to the Holborn Restaurant they did not offer it as English cheese?—They did; they offered it as cheddar.

2062. You want it marked as what?—I do not want it marked, but I want cheddar cheese, that is all.

2063. But there is a cheese which is called Canadian cheddar, is there not?—They called it Canadian "stilton," but they could not succeed. They call it anything. The object of my being here is to prevent them monopolising "cheddar" or using "cheddar"; they have no right to it.

2064. What you want is that any person dining at the Holborn Restaurant shall have the cheese so marked that they can tell whether it was made in America or in England?—I do not say that at all. This manager says it was sold to him for "cheddar."

2065. Do you want it marked in that way?—If this man had a piece of cheese given him, marked in the manner I mentioned, there would be the mark on the crown of the cheese or the bottom end, it would be printed "Canadian."

2066. Would you suggest that that principle should be applied a little further; there are a great many Tasmanian apples, I believe, used for dessert; would you apply it to them?—I certainly should not.

2067. Would you like each apple branded?—I certainly should not.

2068. In order to protect the English grower?—I certainly should not.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2069. Are they sold at a lower price than the English, may I ask?—No, they are sold higher. It is quite absurd. I may not agree with all in the Bill with reference to the necessity of licensing or selling foreign produce.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2070. I think it would be wise to consider the question after all of these superior makers of English cheese marking their cheese, giving it a character, giving it a trade-mark, if they wish protection?—I think it would be an unnecessary interference with them. They have got the name and others pirate it, that is all, they pirate the name. They are going to start a dairy industry throughout New South Wales and in Queensland, and we should have the country flooded with this cheese, "cheddar," "cheddar," and, of course, the real cheddar might as well shut up all at once directly.

Chairman.

2071. You can give us no information of any other cheese than cheddar, I take it?—I do not profess to, because cheddar is the cheese of cheeses. It has wiped out almost the Cheshire; there is hardly any Cheshire sold in London. At places like Liverpool, London, Manchester, and Birmingham we serve customers, they all have cheddar now, they do not think of having Cheshire; Cheshire cheese is going out of taste altogether.

Chairman—continued.

2072. I wanted to know whether your objections are not really towards the factory-made cheese rather than towards colonial cheese?—Well, this cheese is made in the colonies, and marked under such conditions as I have already stated. They could not possibly make a cheddar cheese worthy of the name of cheddar.

2073. There is a good deal of factory-made cheese in England, is there not?—There is, but it is generally a failure. I do not know any but what has been a failure; it does not succeed at all.

2074. Would your objection apply equally to an English factory-made cheese being sold as a cheddar?—Oh, no; as a rule it tells its own tale. I do not object to that factor particularly; I do not say that. All I want is foreign or colonial cheese to come over here with its brand on.

2075. This colonial cheese, as you have told us, is very inferior and it is very indigestible?—Yes.

2076. Does not that very inferiority in taste and its unwholesomeness protect the English consumer sufficiently?—It does in a certain sense; but then it is just the same with the foreign meat; they sell that (as the gentleman before me gave evidence) as Scotch, and there is a great deal of American killed.

2077. Anyone, of course, could tell inferior foreign meat from the best Scotch, but that is not the point we are on?—No.

2078. You can tell an inferior colonial cheese in a moment, I suppose, from your cheddar cheese?—I can, but the general public cannot.

2079. The difference in inferiority is not sufficient, I suppose, for the general consumer to tell it?—No, that is it. The ordinary consumer would not know.

2080. Would it be sufficiently alike in taste?—They could not tell at all; they would not tell.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2081. With reference to the question of the inferiority or superiority of foreign cheese, could you just tell me why you think foreign cheese is sold as English?—Because the man who sells it gets a bigger profit.

2082. It is not sold as English because it is superior to the English?—No, certainly not.

2083. Then with regard to the proportion of cheddar to other English cheeses, you are speaking chiefly for the case of cheddar; could you tell us (I do not ask you to bind yourself exactly to figures) in just an approximate way what proportion the cheddar cheese occupies and the consumption of cheddar to that of any other English cheese or all other English cheeses put together?—One-fourth, more than 25 per cent.

2084. More than a quarter of the English cheese is cheddar?—Yes, more than a quarter.

2085. And there is no other English cheese which comes near cheddar?—There is no other English cheese which comes near cheddar?

2086. I mean to say another quarter of the English cheese is not occupied by the position of Stilton?—Oh, no, certainly not.

2087. Practically cheddar is by a long way the largest in quantity, the largest amount?—My own sale is about 1,600, and we are only one among many.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

2088. You are in the cheddar country, of course?—Yes.

2089. Practically, you live in the great cheese-making county of England?—I do.

2090. All around your district is where cheese is specially made?—It is.

2091. Probably there is no other part of England where cheese is made to such a large extent?—No.

2092. Even in Leicestershire, where Stilton is made?—No, nor Cheshire now.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2093. There is one point I was not quite clear upon. You spoke of the deterioration which takes place in milk before it is manufactured into cheese in New Zealand and Australia. Is not that due to the climate?—The climate has a great deal to do with that, and that is what the American people say. The Canadian people during a certain month, the month of September, have the air nice and clear, and it is not too hot; consequently they make a better quality of cheese in the month of September.

2094. Where is that?—That is in Canada, but it is only about one month in the year, and this cheese is palmed off a great deal as "September make." That has nothing to do with this case at all.

2095. In fact, it amounts to this: During the greater part of the year, in Canada, for instance, it is either much too hot or much too cold to make the best quality of cheese?—Certainly; the same in Australia, the same in Canada, the same everywhere.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2096. I think it has rather been suggested to you that the purchaser would be protected by the difference in taste and by the extra indigestibility of the foreign cheese?—He would in a certain sense.

2097. That has been suggested to you?—Yes.

2098. But is that any protection in the case of a man who sends to a shop and buys a portion of cheese to be consumed later in the day or later in the week?—Well, he sent for a piece of cheddar, and they sent him this colonial and Canadian, Australian, or whatever it might be, and if he had a doubt about it could go to the shop and ask the shopkeeper where he cut this cheese from.

2099. May I put it to you in another way. Are those tests at all equal in value to the test of knowing what it is at the time he buys it?—Well, that is not a test; when he sends for it. If he goes and buys it he sees where it is cut from; he sees the brand on the top, Australia or New Zealand.

2100. But you have told us it is not branded on the top?—Suppose it is not branded, could he tell then, you mean?

2101. Yes?—He could tell if he was a judge; but many people are not much of a judge.

2102. I do not think you understand my point. It has been suggested to you that the foreign cheese is sufficiently indicated, and that the purchaser is sufficiently protected by the difference in quality and the difference in taste, and

the

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

the difference in digestibility?—When he buys it; but he has not digested it then; he has not had it home to digest it; he has not digested it, how can he tell?

2103. That is an answer to my question; he has not digested it, and therefore that protection, if it is worth anything, is, at all events, not to be compared with the protection of knowing what it is at the time he buys it?—At the time he buys it; yes.

Mr. HERBERT SMITH, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Chairman.

2104. YOU are agent to the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Earl of Crewe, General Lord Methuen, and other landowners?—That is so.

2105. You are also a Fellow of the Institute of Surveyors?—Yes.

2106. Chairman and Managing Director of The Wiltshire Bacon Curing Company and The Chippenham Cheese Factory, and an Alderman of the Wiltshire County Council?—That is so.

2107. Do you come here with their authority?—You mean the authority of the persons that I am agent for?

2108. Well, I meant rather those public bodies, the Wiltshire Bacon Curing Company and the Chippenham Cheese Factory?—Yes, I do.

2109. They have authorised you to come to give evidence?—The directors have.

2110. And they agree with your views?—Well, I cannot say that they do, because I have not been through my proof with them.

2111. Then you do not really come here as a representative?—Oh, no, I come here in my private capacity. I only mentioned those companies to show that I have had some dealing with the articles in question.

2112. Nor do you in any way come here to represent the Wiltshire County Council?—Not at all.

2113. You are in favour of marking any first-class agricultural produce?—Yes, I think that people should know what they are buying.

2114. You say you are in favour of marking all first-class agricultural produce; I take it you mean foreign agricultural produce?—Yes.

2115. Or do you suggest anything else?—No, I think it is the foreign agricultural produce that should be marked.

2116. You append a copy of a letter which you have written to the editor of the "Morning Post," 11th May 1893?—Yes. This is the letter: "The Merchandise Marks Act. To the Editor of the 'Morning Post.' Sir,—No one who has read the account of the recent reception by Mr. Mundella of the important deputation which waited upon him in connection with the Merchandise Marks Acts, and your leading article thereon, can doubt that it deals with a matter of great importance to the trade of England. It is especially, however, with regard to the agricultural community that I venture to address you. All must admit that the latter stand in a position which deserves the sympathy and commiseration of their fellow-subjects, and any legitimate assistance that can be rendered to them will, I feel sure, meet with the approval of every Englishman. There can be no question that large quantities of foreign agricultural produce are palmed off upon an unsuspecting and perhaps not sufficiently discriminating public as

Chairman—continued.

British productions. No doubt in the case of meat and eggs, &c., there are difficulties in the way of applying these Acts, and it would seem an impossibility that each joint of meat should be labelled and each egg marked, but customers should know their place of origin. There is, however, one article of agricultural produce which has a very large consumption, and which it is most easy to mark and identify, yet it is, strange to say, an article in which probably more frauds are perpetrated than in any other. I allude to bacon and hams. In the 'Grocer,' of 15th April last, there is a report of two prosecutions under the Merchandise Marks Act for selling foreign bacon as Wiltshire and Irish, in which two provision dealers were each fined 10*l.* and 15 guineas costs. It is well known that Ireland produces fine bacon and hams, and that Wiltshire is deservedly famed for the excellence of its similar products. It is not however known, especially in regard to the latter, that the supply is just now limited, and it behoves all those who buy it that they should see they are getting the genuine article. All first-quality Wiltshire bacon is branded as such, and bears the names and trade mark of the curers, and there can be no difficulty in the purchaser making sure that he is really buying the genuine article. The same may be said of Irish; and I would here appeal to the public, in the interests of themselves as well as the agricultural and trading community, to satisfy themselves that they are purchasing what they are asking for. The practice of selling American and other foreign bacon as Wiltshire or Irish is, I need scarcely say, most reprehensible. It is unfair to the farmer, who goes to great expense to breed and properly feed a first-class bacon pig; it is unfair to the curer, who gives the farmer high prices with the view to obtaining the best raw material, and who provides large quantities of labour and most expensive machinery in order to properly manufacture a first-class article; and it is unfair to the honest trader, who really gives his customer what he believes he is purchasing. Everyone will sincerely sympathise with the latter, who will not sell his goods under false names and thus deceive his customers, and who prefers his good name and less money to the unholy extra profit of selling American bacon as genuine Wiltshire. Mere sympathy, however, is of little use; the upright man is deserving of practical assistance and protection. Unfortunately, with the public the great test is cheapness, and in the endeavour to attain this they will often purchase an article thinking they get a bargain, whereas in reality they are being charged more than its real value, because they are not buying what they think they are. The present wholesale price of first-quality genuine Wiltshire bacon is

Chairman—continued.

about 9*d.* per lb. by the side, taking fine and inferior cuts together, so your readers may judge whether it can be sold at anything like the price at which, I regret to say, it is now so often offered. Yours, &c., H. Herbert Smith, Chippenham, Wilts, May 9th 1893?"—Yes.

2117. You are acquainted with the Wiltshire bacon trade?—Yes.

2118. Will you kindly tell us what you desire to bring before the Committee with reference to that?—With regard to the marking, we, of course, do mark Wiltshire bacon now at the present time; that is to say, we mark a very large percentage of it; but if we have any pigs that turn out inferior (because you must know that in the bacon trade all pigs are not alike, some are a very good quality, but occasionally, even in Wiltshire, you get pigs that are not of first-class quality, that is bad quality of pigs, bad fed pigs and soft pigs), we should not mark those, because we do not consider that they are worthy of a mark. We sell that bacon as unbranded bacon, and it is on our price lists as unbranded bacon.

2119. And therefore sold cheaper?—Oh, of course, much cheaper. We quote it on our price lists as a cheaper article altogether, an inferior article. Then with regard to all the first quality of bacon, that we mark in seven places: we mark it on the shoulder, we mark it on the ham, or gammon, as it is called in bacon, we mark it in three places on the back, and we mark it in the centre of the side, and we mark the streak, that really is the belly of the pig, it is called the streak. That is the technical word for it in the trade. So that as far as our Wiltshire bacon is concerned it is already fully marked.

2120. Can you tell me whether any foreign bacon comes in unmarked now?—I think some of it comes in unmarked.

2121. I ask, because we went to see a place where they dealt in a large amount of bacon the other day, and apparently it was all marked?—Yes, but I should imagine you only saw the first quality with the brands on it, but I should think there is a good deal of bacon comes in that is not worthy of a mark, and they do not put a mark on it; it would be unbranded Continental bacon in the same way that there is unbranded Wiltshire bacon.

2122. Of course, branding bacon in no way injures the quality of the meat?—Not in the least; it is merely an impress with an iron; it just slightly scorches the side.

2123. That would not be the case with meat?—You could not brand meat with a hot iron certainly. I believe the mark is made in Denmark with an indiarubber impress; I have seen it marked there.

2124. You have seen the meat marked in Denmark?—I have seen it marked at the butchers' shops.

2125. I think it would be interesting if you could tell us about the process of marking?—I am not acquainted with the process. I am not acquainted with any of the details of marking fresh meat in Denmark. In walking along the streets of Copenhagen and other towns I have

Chairman—continued.

noticed that they do mark meat (it is marked with an indiarubber impress and with violet fluid), even down to a mutton chop.

2126. Even down to a mutton chop?—I have seen it so marked there.

2127. Where was that marked?—It is done with a small indiarubber impress, and, as far as I could see, it is just pressed on the side of the meat.

2128. Or on the chop?—Or on the chop.

2129. With a purple colour?—It is purple or violet. It would be some preparation; it would not be ink, but I do not profess to know anything about that; that is merely incidental.

2130. I think it would be very interesting to the Committee if you could give us information about it; however, we will go on to the matters upon which you are desirous of speaking; you want to tell us something about cheese also, do not you?—Yes; I should like to say a few words with regard to that. We have a large cheese factory at Chippenham. It is a separate company, but it joins on to the Wiltshire Bacon Curing Company. There we turn out a very large quantity of Cheddar cheese every year; about 90 lbs. weight each cheese is. We affix a mark to these cheeses in some cases and not in others. That is an impress mark. It is a stamp on it, "English Cheddar."

2131. Is it the best cheeses that you mark in that way?—We really mark them more to suit the trade than anything else. Some people who deal with us prefer not to have the mark on. We do not put it on if we have inferior cheese. We should not mark that "Finest English," because it would not be finest English. We mark all our finest cheese with an impress stamp, except in cases where our customers do not wish to have the mark.

2132. You find no difficulty at all about marking it, I suppose?—None whatever.

Mr. Heywood Johnstone.

2133. I suppose this is not a trademark you refer to; have you a registered trade mark?—Yes, we have.

2134. Is that trade mark put upon the bacon to which you refer, and the cheese?—Yes, it is.

Chairman.

2135. That is the mark, is it?—That is the mark. I may say at once that our bacon and cheese come under the Merchandise Marks Act at the present time.

2136. Now, do you imagine that any great harm is done by the foreign bacon that comes in unmarked?—Well, no doubt, some time ago there was a great deal of foreign bacon sold as Wiltshire bacon, but I do not think there is very much now. You will see at the time when I wrote that letter (which is 1893) that I did at that time feel very strongly about it, but I think that the Merchandise Marks Act has, to a great extent, been successfully worked in the way of protecting the consumer and producer, and I do not think there is very much fraud now in the way of selling foreign bacon as Wiltshire bacon.

2137. You say the Merchandise Marks Act; that would only apply to foreign bacon which was sent in marked as English?—What I meant

Chairman—continued.

was this: good Wiltshire and Irish bacon now is all branded. Before the Merchandise Marks Act was started they very often used to sell foreign bacon as English bacon, as Irish bacon, or as Wiltshire bacon, and now, since the Merchandise Marks Act has been established, that does not occur to the extent that it did. A few cases occur every now and then, but not to any large extent.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2138. I should like to know when the Merchandise Marks Act began to operate in this favourable direction?—I forget the date when the Act was passed, but at the time when there were a good many prosecutions under it was about the time that I wrote the letter that I have put in for the Committee to see; I say that since that time there has been a great improvement, and I do not think that now there is much fraud.

Chairman.

2139. It was passed long before 1893?—Yes, I know it was passed before 1893; I am quite aware of that, but it was that time when there was some stir made in it, and the matter was taken up.

2140. The Merchandise Marks Act would only affect bacon wrongly stamped abroad as of English origin; it would not affect bacon that came in unmarked?—It would affect it so far that the bacon unmarked might have been sold as Wiltshire bacon. I believe there have been cases of that sort.

2141. That would not be affected by the Merchandise Marks Act, I think?—No, but the Wiltshire bacon itself has got a mark on it, so that if a person was to sell bacon of foreign origin as a Wiltshire bacon that bore that brand then he would be liable to be prosecuted.

2142. If he branded it, undoubtedly; but supposing he sold it unbranded?—If he sold it as representing a branded article he would be liable to be prosecuted.

2143. He would be liable under a different Act altogether then, I think; I think that would be the Food and Drugs Adulteration Act; certainly not the Merchandise Marks Act. The Merchandise Marks Act only applied to the counterfeiting of an English trade mark or a mark of representation that the article was made in England, when it was really made abroad. I want to know whether there was much deception of that sort and that foreign bacon was marked as English origin and sent here?—It was marked in this way: that some traders put a placard on the top of the bacon; for instance, they put a shoulder of bacon out on the shop window, and they would put on that shoulder of bacon a label saying that it was Wiltshire bacon, but that bacon need not necessarily have been marked on the side when they put the label on a piece of it; that is what I mean.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2144. "Calne," "Wiltshire bacon" branded on?—Yes. For instance, a person might take a shoulder of bacon with no mark upon it, when it came into the English market it had no mark upon it, but he puts it into the shop window with a little stamp on it or a little ticket on it marked "Wiltshire bacon." Those cases came under the Merchandise Marks Act.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

Chairman.

2145. It would certainly come under that, or one of the other Acts; it would be a false pretence, but what I want to know is whether the foreign bacon exporter (the man who exports it from abroad to here) ever used to stamp it with English stamps before the Merchandise Marks Act?—No, I do not think so; not to my knowledge.

2146. Is there much difference in the quality?—Yes, there is a good deal of difference in the quality. I should like to give the Committee a few words with regard to that. The best Wiltshire bacon fetches the highest price in the market now; it is a very good bacon, and it is a good quality of pig that is fed there. It is about 20*s.* a cwt. over the United States bacon. Then there is what they call "Canadian pea-fed bacon." The quality of that is about 10*s.* under the best Wiltshire. These are about the market prices I am quoting. Then again Danish bacon is about 6*s.* under; Danish bacon is very good bacon; it is made from excellent pigs, and they are on the whole very well fed, but they do not quite come up in quality to either Wiltshire or Irish; they are about 6*s.* under Wiltshire. The best Waterford is 4*s.* under Wiltshire; so you see Wiltshire is at the top.

2147. How does Yorkshire compare?—There is very little bacon that actually comes from Yorkshire; there is hardly any trade in bacon, except provincially, locally.

2148. There is a great deal locally?—There is a great deal locally, but there is no Yorkshire bacon quoted in the market.

2149. They eat it all in Yorkshire?—They eat it all in Yorkshire. They have a large trade in hams, but their bacon is not a recognised thing in the market like Wiltshire, Waterford, and Danish. So you will see Wiltshire is first. It is *facile princeps* in the bacon trade, and the market for it is limited in consequence of its being a high price. Then comes the Irish (the Limerick and Waterford) bacon; of course there are inferior lots of Limerick and Waterford. Then comes Danish, then Canadian pea fed; and then the United States. They are all very good in their way.

2150. There is no really very bad quality?—No, the United States bacon is a good food for the people. It is inferior stuff compared with Wiltshire or best Irish; it is soft; it is chiefly made from pigs fed on maize without a sufficient quantity of dairy stuff; the consequence is it gets gelatinous and soft; it does not become nice and hard like proper bacon; but it is good food. The Canadian pea-fed bacon is of good quality. That is a good bacon, but it does not, of course, compare with Danish bacon, which is superior to Canadian, but Canadian bacon is better than United States bacon.

2151. On what ground are you in favour of distinguishing marking so as to distinguish between them?—I am merely in favour of it for this reason

Chairman—continued.

reason, that I think people ought to know what they are buying. I do not pronounce an opinion whether I think it will do any particular good either one way or the other, but I think it is for the protection of the public.

2152. Solely for the protection of the consumer you want to see it?—Almost entirely. I do not think the agriculturist would gain much by it.

2153. You do not think the Wiltshire bacon has suffered much by importing foreign bacon?—Well, it has suffered in a way. No doubt if there was no foreign bacon imported we should do a much larger trade, but it has not suffered in the way that we have really suffered from fraud to any extent. As I say, the amount of fraud now is small; still there is a small quantity of fraud; now of course we are to a very great extent protected by the Merchandise Marks Act.

2154. Is there anything more you would like to bring before the Committee in your evidence in chief?—I should like to say a few words in regard to cheese. Of course, there are a great many different qualities of cheese, and some of the cheese which comes from abroad is, I think, very good cheese, and some of it is very bad, and so it is in the case of English. Some of it is very good, some of it is very bad. I do not think there is any cheese imported from abroad that will come up to the very first quality of English cheddar cheese, that peculiarly silky texture that you get with the very fine quality of English cheese; and then you will find that in the very fine quality of English cheese it at once asserts itself upon the market and a price is obtained, which is far above that obtained for any cheese that is sent into this country. Then there is no doubt, on the other hand, that there is a very large quantity of cheese which is made in England which is inferior, and I should not like personally myself, and in the interest of the British agriculturists, to see that marked; I think it would damage their reputation. The Canadian cheese is a useful cheese. I do not say it is a very high quality, but it is a useful cheese. There is a very large trade with it at the present time. I do not mean to say that there are not instances in which people go in and ask for English cheddar and have Canadian cheddar given to them instead of it, and it is on that ground that I think it would be a good thing that foreign produce should be marked.

2155. But if all foreign produce were marked then it would be evident that all that are unmarked would be English, would it not?—Quite so.

2156. In that case a consumer would detect at once that the inferior stuff that you did not wish to mark was English?—Yes; that would be so.

2157. And if it was inferior itself to the foreign, I presume, it would lead the consumer, if he could get it at the same price, to go and buy the foreign?—Yes; there is, of course, that to be said. Then, on the other hand, there is the fact that often a good quality of English cheese is asked for and a Canadian cheese is given. You must weigh one against the other.

Chairman—continued.

2158. Did you hear the last witness?—I could not hear him very well, because he did not speak up sufficiently for me to do so, but I heard some of his evidence. I was going to remark as to the Canadian cheese, as the Committee know, and as the last witness said, that is all factory cheese, and I agree with the last witness so far, that it is doubtful, except under very exceptional circumstances, whether you can make really superlatively good cheese at a factory. I am chairman of a factory cheese company myself; so I have a good deal of experience. We make in Wiltshire an exceedingly good cheese, a cheese that almost makes the top price, but not quite; and I do not believe that we shall ever make a cheese that will fetch the same price as that of a few dairies in Somersetshire; but we make a cheese sufficiently good to be highly commended at the Dairy Shows, and to be within a few shillings of the very top price in the market, and it has the advantage of great uniformity in quality.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2159. Is that Cheddar or North Wilts?—That is Cheddar. I may say with regard to Cheddar, "Cheddar" is merely a style of cheese; Cheddar was originally made at a small village in Somersetshire of the name of Cheddar, and that was the style of cheese that was made at that place. Then that style of cheese gradually spread itself all over England; it has spread itself in Scotland, in Wiltshire, in Gloucestershire, in all the cheese-making districts in England; and it is made also in the cheese-making districts of Canada, the United States, Australia, and other places.

Chairman.

2160. Do you think their cheddars is very seriously inferior?—I think some of the cheddars are very seriously inferior. The United States cheddars are very poor stuff indeed, and I think some of the Australian cheddars are not up to much; but I am bound to say there is a great deal of cheddar made abroad that is very good indeed; although they are competitors with us, I am bound honestly to confess it.

2161. You do not think the difference in quality would be sufficient protection to the consumer?—Of course, the difference in quality is a very great protection to the consumer no doubt, because people buy Canadian cheese as a rule, knowing it is Canadian cheese, they buy it because they like it.

2162. There is very little fraud, you think?—I do not think there is very much fraud. No doubt, there are cases, the English public are not very discriminating, and their great test of things is cheapness as a rule, and I think they sometimes go into a shop and say, We want some English cheddar. The person who serves them produces cheese, but he does not produce English cheddar. He produces Canadian cheddar. They taste it, think it very good, and buy it as English cheddar; and they are paying, perhaps, 8*d.* and 9*d.* a pound for it as English cheddar when they ought to be

paying

Chairman—continued.

paying for it only about 6½*d.* as Canadian Cheddar. I think that happens occasionally.

2163. Then the grievance is really that they are asked to pay a price, and do really pay the price of the English cheese?—Yes, occasionally.

2164. If it made them ill they would not have it again?—It does not make them ill.

2165. The last witness implied that it was very indigestible?—They would not buy it again if it made them ill. After all, quality is a very great test. You may occasionally be taken in over an article, but quality is the thing that finds its level in the market.

2166. Quality is of far more importance than any mark really?—In my opinion it is.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2167. So far as your experience of marking Wiltshire bacon has gone then, and cheese also, I suppose we may take it the mark has been a distinct advantage?—The mark has been an advantage.

2168. A distinct advantage?—It has.

2169. What I mean is, it has guaranteed you a better price for the article you have marked?—Undoubtedly it has; but I may tell you that I should not be in favour of being compelled to mark it, because if I was compelled to mark it I should have to put the mark upon inferior bacon.

2170. If you were compelled to mark it you would get over that difficulty by marking one portion as "best quality," and the other as "second best quality," because I suppose all your customers know that if they come to you to buy some bacon which is not marked there is a reason for its not being marked; it is not as good quality as that which is marked?—No; that is to say, we put it in our price list as "unbranded bacon." Our price for that would be some 10*s.* per cwt. less than for the branded bacon.

2171. In other words, your trade mark is of considerable value to you as a company?—It is.

2172. Do not you think that giving a trade mark to foreign-produced bacon would have a tendency to improve its price in the market, and make it to that extent a greater competitor?—Oh, they have trade marks now for foreign bacon.

2173. They have a trade mark now?—Yes.

2174. Then, if they have a trade mark now, what necessity is there for further marking their bacon?—Actually, in the case of bacon, I do not know that there is any great necessity for it.

2175. You do not think there is any great necessity for it in the case of bacon?—I do not think there is any great necessity for it in the case of bacon. There may be some other articles; I think there is a good deal to be said in the case of cheese.

2176. Confining it purely to bacon?—Yes.

2177. You think the marking of bacon at the present time is sufficient as to its origin?—I think the bacon market sufficiently protected under the Merchandise Marks Act.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

2178. You do not treat it as a matter of any great fraud?—Not to any great extent; not to any large amount; I do not think so. That is my experience of the bacon trade.

2179. With regard to cheese you have been very frank, and your evidence has pleased me very much with respect to the quality of cheese which comes from abroad. Of course my experience has taught me that, perhaps, while what you call the "superlative" quality of cheese is not produced abroad, yet there is a very good quality of cheese comes from Canada?—That is so.

2180. If you had that marked in a special way, what real advantage could it be to you as cheesemakers?—I do not see that it is much advantage to us. As I said at the outset, my only view of the matter is that I think the English public should know what they are buying. I did not express an opinion, whether it would be an advantage to the agriculturist or whether it would be an advantage to the manufacturer, but I think that the British public should know what they are buying.

2181. Then you do not come here with any idea that if this Bill were passed it would be of any distinct advantage to cheesemakers in this country?—To the agriculturists?

2182. Yes?—Well, there would be a certain remote advantage attaching to them, because there are a certain number of people who occasionally get taken in over cheese; they ask for English cheese and they do not get it. Therefore there is some advantage attaching to the agriculturist, but it is remote; I admit it is remote.

2183. Would not that advantage be more than destroyed, so to speak, if you required all foreign cheese to be marked. Take Camembert, for example, some of which is being made in this country at the present time; the English Camembert would not be marked, would it?—That would not be marked.

2184. Well, a gentleman who wanted to buy Camembert cheese would probably buy it properly marked?—Yes, but the amount of Camembert cheese that is made in England is almost infinitesimal.

2185. It is very small I know?—Therefore, the actual figures in cash represented by Camembert English cheese would really be like a drop of water in a bucket.

2186. But is not it an industry that you cheese farmers, so to speak, are endeavouring to cultivate?—I do not think it is very much. You see those are fancy goods, and they are a lot of trouble; they are difficult to manipulate. They are more likely I think to be taken up, perhaps, in factories; and what really the farmer and manufacturer aims at is an article with which he can deal with the masses so that he can get a large turnover. If you do not get a large turnover you cannot make much money.

2187. Do you think the masses care whether the cheese they buy is made in England or in America; is it not a question of quality and price?—I do not think the masses care twopence

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

about it, but I think there are a great many people who are of a little better class than the ordinary mass of people who do care.

2188. Sentimental people?—Yes, who wish to have English cheese. I think, perhaps, there is something a little beyond sentiment. They think the best English cheese is better than any other, and they are quite right; I think it is.

2189. They would rather eat English than American?—No, I do not say that. I think they ask for English thinking they are going to get a very good cheese, without respect to its origin.

2190. You made the remark that you thought foreign cheese was sold sometimes for English. Do you really think that applies at all; I mean amongst the better class of grocers in the country. Have you any evidence of it?—I should think it is small.

2191. You yourself have never proved it?—No, we have not. There have been several cases under the Merchandise Marks Act of bacon, I do not know of cheese, I do not know of one. I cannot give you one in cheese.

2192. Are you aware that in a large grocer's shop you very often see the two kinds of cheese, the English cheese and the American cheese, properly marked?—No, I have never seen it myself. I daresay it is, but I cannot speak from my own experience of having seen the two together.

2193. We may take it that, so far as your knowledge goes, you do not think there is much fraud?—I do not think there is very much fraud. I am speaking now of bacon and cheese only. I have not gone into the question of meat. I should think probably there was more fraud in meat than in bacon and cheese, because bacon and cheese are to a certain extent protected now.

2194. So far as this Bill goes as affecting either cheese or bacon, you do not think it will do either much good or much harm?—I do not think it will do the agriculturist and the manufacturer very much good or very much harm. I think it is more a question for the public.

2195. And even on that question you are not prepared to express a decided opinion, that is to say, not to back it with evidence?—No, not to back it with evidence.

Mr. *Brigg*.

2196. There is one point I was not quite clear about, when you spoke a little while ago as to the marking of foreign bacon when it comes into your hands. I understood you to say that if that bacon was marked contrary to its proper nature it would come under the Merchandise Marks Act?—Well, I do not think that was quite what I intended. I may have said so, but it is not quite what I intended. What I meant was this: that foreign bacon that was not marked as foreign bacon might be sold with a ticket on it as Wiltshire bacon or Irish bacon. That is what I meant.

2197. I suppose, as a matter of fact, a large quantity of foreign bacon of the kind you have described, Danish and so on, comes into your hands in Wiltshire, and then you smoke it and

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

put your brand upon it?—Oh, no, we never do that; we should never dream of doing such a thing as that.

2198. May I ask this: Do you positively say that you smoke nothing in your factory but pigs that are grown in Wiltshire?—Wiltshire and the neighbouring counties.

2199. Well, there are a good many counties round Wiltshire, and they are pretty large one's too, I suppose?—Yes, that is why we are able to get a sufficient supply of pigs from them.

2200. The South-West of England, too?—Yes, the South-West of England. The dairy district all round there.

2201. Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, and part of Oxfordshire?—Yes, but we should not dream of taking in foreign bacon, smoking it and putting our brand on it; it would be a distinct fraud if we did. That would not be done by us.

2202. I am strongly of opinion that that does apply to bacon curing generally?—You may take it from me that that is not the case with the company I am connected with, and I should not dream of doing such a thing for one moment. I should consider myself a most fraudulent person if I did so.

2203. You spoke, Danish 6*s*. lower, Waterford 4*s*. lower, and so on; I took it from that that you were dealing in that?—No, I was only quoting the market prices.

2204. That is in the smoked condition?—In their smoked condition. It makes no difference whether you take it smoked or green. The smoked is always a certain number of shillings above the green.

2205. May I ask, is there a large quantity of smoked brought into England?—No; no smoked bacon is brought into England; none whatever, to my knowledge.

2206. Nothing treated with pyrolignic acid?—No. As far as my experience extends, it is all smoked in England.

2207. Unsmoked in the ordinary way?—Yes.

2208. Not treated with pyrolignic acid?—No, not so far as I know.

2209. Nor with a solution of pyrolignic acid?—That may be done in the trade, but it is not to my knowledge.

2210. It is better not perhaps to hint at too many things, you being a manufacturer, of what might be done?—We do not do it ourselves. We only use the elm sawdust, and I think certainly the whole of the Irish bacon is smoked with sawdust.

2211. You said that Danish fed was very good?—It is.

2212. You did not give us any idea why it was better than the other?—You mean better than American bacon?

2213. Why was it better?—I will tell you. In the first place, the Danes have paid very great attention to their breed of pigs. I do not suppose any country has made as much progress in the breeding of a pig that is suitable for a bacon curer and suitable for bacon than the Danes have during the last ten years. Then, in addition to that, they have very large quantities of dairy waste products, and the dairy waste products make excellent meat.

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

2214. We may infer from that, that the Danish farmer not only competes with us by making good butter which produces him a large amount of waste product; but that out of that waste product he makes a very good bacon which also comes over here and competes with us quite as severely in the bacon trade as the butter does in the butter trade?—That is so.

2215. And with respect to cheese, you say you do not make what is called "foreign fancy cheeses"?—No; we make nothing but Cheddar. We make a very large quantity of Cheddar; several thousand cheeses in the year.

2216. You have not given your attention to making fancy cheeses in Somersetshire?—No.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2217. You have been in Denmark yourself, I understand?—I have.

2218. And seen fresh meat marked there?—I have.

2219. Down to the very small mutton chop?—I have seen it down to a very small joint.

2220. Have you, to your knowledge, eaten marked meat in Denmark?—I cannot say, because when I was there I was stopping about at hotels; I assume I must have done so, because I believe that all meat is marked in Denmark.

2221. At all events, you detected no difference when it was put before you on the table?—No.

2222. As far as you know it had no effect in destroying the quality, or injuring the palatability of the meat?—I could not see how it could have any; it would be only a strip of printing, done with some harmless compound.

2223. At all events, it is practicable; it is done in Denmark and the Danish farmer is not prejudiced by it?—That is so.

2224. I may take all those three assumptions as absolutely justified in your experience?—Yes.

2225. That it is done; that the meat is not injured; and that the farmer is not injured?—Yes, quite so.

2226. I understood you to say you were in favour of marking first-class products?—Yes.

2227. I presume you draw a distinction because you imagine there is not the same competition between the inferior classes. A man, if you follow me, who wishes the home product, is a man who will demand a high quality of product?—Yes.

2228. That is the reason why you do not wish to go beyond the marking of first-class products?—That is so to a great extent; but I think also that if we were to mark inferior English goods it would be only making a further market for the foreigner, because it would draw the attention of the public to them.

2229. It is not that we should mark the English goods, but foreign goods?—If we only marked foreign goods, as I say, I do not see any objection to it; it does not hurt.

2230. If only foreign goods are marked you see no reason to confine the marking to first-class ones?—Except what was pointed out by the Chairman just now, that if you marked all foreign goods everything else that was in the market would be English, and therefore all inferior English goods would be brought in direct comparison with the others.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

2231. You think the inferior English article might be marked "foreign produce"?—I think so.

2232. Would not that rather tend, in the ordinary course of business, to compel a better English product?—Well, I think that there is something in that; I agree with you there.

2233. A man finding the inferior product less merchantable would do his best to improve upon it?—That is so. I intended to say a word about that. My opinion is that the English farmer does want some stimulus at the present time; that although there are a great many farmers in England who make very good goods, still there are a great many farmers who make very bad ones; there is no doubt about it, and those people would, to some extent, be stimulated perhaps by the fact that their goods would go out of the market altogether; and only the best English goods and the foreign goods would be left unless they exerted themselves to make better ones.

2234. The best farmer would be stimulated; the active and competent farmer would be rewarded?—The active and competent farmer would not be hurt.

2235. He would get a better market for his goods, would not he?—I do not know that he would get a better market for his goods.

2236. Would not there be more demand for them?—He would be quite safe in selling his goods for what they were.

2237. We have been told by many witnesses who have come before us that if the foreign product was marked there would be a greater demand for the superior English product; do you agree with that?—I do not exactly see why.

2238. Do you or do you not agree with it? Do you think it would make no difference to the demand. Mind! I am dealing with the best product only, the best meat and the best cheese?—I think it would tell in favour of the demand when I come to think it over.

2239. It would tell in favour of the best home-made articles?—Yes, I think it would.

2240. I am glad that you take time to think before you answer a question of so much moment as that. I think I understood you to say that you know there are cases in which English cheese is asked for and foreign cheese supplied. Did I rightly understand you to say that?—Well, I believe it to be the case. I said I am not prepared here with any evidence to prove it.

2241. You have no specific cases, but you believe it to be the fact?—I believe it to be the fact.

2242. That is to say, that where English cheese is asked for Canadian is sometimes supplied?—Yes.

2243. No doubt to the advantage of the supplier?—No doubt to the advantage of the supplier.

2244. And equally to the prejudice of the buyer?—And equally to the prejudice of the buyer.

2245. And apart from that, you mentioned

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

to us the case of a shop window in which there was a side of bacon foreign grown, and adjacent to it a card which described it as "Best Wiltshire"?—Yes.

2246. At the present time there is nothing whatever to prevent what I may call the passive acquiescence of the seller in the deception as regards the buyer. Suppose the buyer takes it into his head that this is "best Wiltshire" there is nothing to prevent the seller acquiescing?—He would be liable to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act, I think.

2247. We have the Merchandise Marks Act here. Would you suggest to me what particular clause of the Merchandise Marks Act would make a man liable to prosecution for that?—It would take me some time to find the clause, for I am not intimately acquainted with the Merchandise Marks Act, but I think I could refer you to cases in which prosecutions have occurred.

2248. If you could tell the Committee that in your own knowledge a man has been punished under the Merchandise Marks Act for exposing for sale without any label at all, without any trade designation, what is a foreign product and what the purchaser believed to be an English one. Do you follow me?—Yes.

2249. Have you any cases of that sort in your mind?—I have several cases in my mind; but you see these Acts are complicated, and I am not a lawyer, but I will see if I can find anything in the list I have in my hand. Here is a list of cases that I have got under the Merchandise Marks Act:—"For sale of American ham as English, fined 5*l.* and full costs"; "for sale of American ham as English, fined 5*l.* and full costs."; "sale of American roll" (that is, bacon) "as English, fined 50*l.* and full costs, including witnesses' expenses."

2250. Have you sufficient detail of those cases with you to be able to tell me whether the ham, or whether the roll, was marked. Was the ham marked "English" or "Wiltshire," or something of that sort?—I presume it must have been marked, or there could not have been prosecutions under the Merchandise Marks Act.

2251. That rather answers my point. I want to put to you this, that under the Merchandise Marks Act if the article sold is not marked at all there is no protection. Here you have a marked article. Supposing that ham had not been marked at all, had had nothing on it to denote either English or American, and was then sold without any words saying whether it was English or American but sold at the price of the English ham, does the Merchandise Marks Act touch it then?—I take it that under the Merchandise Marks Act it must have had a ticket put upon it.

2252. I will put it in another way: To create any offence under the Merchandise Marks Act there must be a representation to the eye, must there not, of a mark?—Yes, that is so.

2253. A mark of the place of origin or trade description?—Yes.

2254. And if there is no representation at all to the eye or to the ear there is no offence at all?—I believe that is so.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

2255. Therefore if a man goes into a shop and buys a piece of meat at the English price, meat which he believes to be English and which is not really, he is absolutely without protection unless the seller represents to him deliberately and intentionally that it is English, in which case it would be a false pretence?—Yes.

2256. Apart from that, buying an article at a higher price than it is worth, and believing it to be something that it is not, is not an offence under the Act?—I take it that is correct.

2257. That is to say, if a man went into a shop and said, "I want some Wiltshire bacon," and a pound of bacon is cut off and handed over to him, nothing is said on either side, and he takes it home and it is not Wiltshire bacon, the seller could not be proceeded against under the Merchandise Marks Act?—That is so.

2258. One further word, and that is with regard to the expression "Cheddar" "Cheddar Cheese;" it is not a test of locality now, is it?—No.

2259. Is it a description of a particular mode of manufacture?—It is a particular mode of manufacture and a style of cheese.

2260. If climate and other conditions were equal the cheddar cheese might be produced in any part of the globe where cheese can be made?—The cheddar style of cheese might certainly.

2261. What I mean is this, the expression "cheddar cheese" is not indicative of the cheese having been made in any particular locality?—No.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2262. I think the Committee has found reason to believe from what a previous witness has said that there has been a case tried in court with regard to the expression "cheddar;" are you aware of that?—No, I was not aware of that.

2263. Now I want to ask one or two things about bacon. You are more acquainted with the bacon trade, are you not, from your position as chairman of a factory?—I am chairman of a bacon and of a cheese factory as well.

2264. Is it the case in the bacon trade that all superior sorts are branded?—Yes, all the superior sorts of bacon are branded; whether Wiltshire or Irish, or whatever they are; they are all branded. They are generally branded with the name of the curer in Ireland.

2265. And registered or marked?—And registered or marked as well.

2266. And they are marked generally in seven places?—That is so.

2267. Is that general in the trade?—That is general in the trade.

2268. Are they branded, or is it simply a stamp?—They are branded.

2269. With a hot iron?—With a hot iron; it is only the skin that is slightly branded.

2270. From your general knowledge, do you think there is any reason why other kinds of meat should not be stamped in the same kind of way?—None whatever.

2271. In your opinion it would not hamper the trade?—Not a bit.

2272. If foreign carcases were stamped in much the same way it would not?—On the contrary,

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

trary, it would rather help it; I am in favour of its being stamped.

2273. Is your cheese marked in the press, or is it marked afterwards?—It is marked in the press.

2274. The mark is impressed?—Yes, it is impressed.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2275. I take it, you consider that both cheese and meat ought to be marked in the interest of the general public?—Yes.

2276. And consumers?—Yes.

2277. So that they might know what they are buying?—I think that all foreign produce should be marked in order that they should know what they are buying.

2278. All that comes in from abroad?—Yes.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

2279. But you do not think it would be fair in any way, or right, to call upon the English to mark their own produce?—No, I do not, for the reasons that I have given.

2280. But you do not see any difficulties in the way of carrying out this marking?—I do not see that there would be the slightest difficulty myself. There might be a difficulty if you went into very great details, that is to say, if you marked every egg or every little bit of meat.

2281. You have read the Bill, have you not?—No, I have not read the bill.

2282. The Bill does not propose to do that?—I presumed that it did not intend to do it in detail, although I believe in Denmark they do do it in detail; but I think, in a large trading country like England, it would harass the trade very much to do it in detail.

Mr. W. H. BEACH, M.R.C.V.S., called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2283. You are a member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons?—I am.

2284. And ex-mayor of Bridgnorth?—Yes.

2285. You have a special invention, which you desire to see applied to the marking of meat, which you think might be useful in case of the passing of a Bill similar to this?—Yes.

2286. You showed us (the Committee) that instrument yesterday that you have before you, on the steamer going down to Deptford, did you not?—A modification of it.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2287. You showed the Committee the instrument you had yesterday, and the way it marked on glass and on wood?—Yes.

2288. I think it was rather suggested by some Members of the Committee that it would be more to the point if you showed it to us marking meat itself?—Yes; I presumed that I should have had an opportunity of doing that yesterday at Deptford, but that opportunity did not arise.

2289. I understood you were going to attend here to-day to show us the instrument marking a mutton chop?—Yes. (*The witness produced a mutton chop, marked it on the fat and lean, and explained the working of the instrument.*)

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

2290. I should like to ask you two questions; one is as to the cost of this implement, supposing it came into practical working; is it an expensive article to manufacture and put on the market?—The instrument for marking meat and cheese would cost about six or seven guineas.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

2291. Each one of these instruments?—Yes, with the sprocket arrangement that I explained. This (the instrument) is made of platinum and iridium, which, as you know, are very expensive metals, but they are very durable.

2292. But the article itself, not such as you produce, but such as you have described for marking a number of articles rapidly, would cost six or seven guineas?—Yes, it would.

2293. Is it a durable article?—Very durable.

2294. There would be no serious expense of renewal?—None.

2295. One further question: can you give me any idea as to the speed at which the marking would be carried on; would it be as quick as a man passing his hand over an animal?—It would, quite; you could mark a carcase in 15 seconds easily.

2296. One man could mark a carcase in 15 seconds easily?—Yes.

2297. Do you say that from actual experiment made by yourself?—No, I do not, because I have not fitted the instrument up; but I can tell from operations on horses with the thermo-cautery and marks that I have made on glass and different things.

2298. You reckon that 15 seconds per carcase would be the pace at which your instrument would operate?—It would.

Chairman.

2299. I take it that the instrument brands the meat, does it not?—It does.

2300. Like a hot iron?—Yes.

Friday, 23rd July, 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Doughty.	Mr. A. H. Smith.
Sir William Houldsworth.	Mr. Parker Smith.
Mr. Kilbride.	

SIR ELLIOTT LEES in the Chair.

Mr. JOHN KELLITT, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2301. YOU are the President of the Federation of Grocers' Association, are you not?—Yes, sir.

2302. And President of the Liverpool Grocers and Provision Dealers' Association, and a director of Fowler Brothers, Limited?—Yes.

2303. And you have been a retail grocer and provision dealer for 45 years?—Yes.

2304. You are also a City Counsellor of Liverpool, and a Justice of the Peace of the City of Liverpool?—Yes.

2305. Whom do you appear to represent?—I represent the Federation and trade interested in this matter in Liverpool.

2306. The Grocers' Federation?—Yes.

2307. How many retailers have you connected with it?—We have about 10,000 members in connection with it.

2308. I understand you would have preferred that more witnesses should have been called from the evidence which I have before me. I see a paragraph of your printed evidence states that the Federation have something to urge about the number of witnesses that can be called; is that so?—They felt aggrieved. We understood at our Federation meeting last week that only one witness would be heard from the trade, and opinions were expressed at that Federation meeting that it was not doing justice to the views that would be held by the members of the trade; we thought we ought to have a larger representation of witnesses.

2309. Therefore they desired that you should be called?—Yes, sir.

2310. Your branch of the retail provision trade had no opportunity to express its views before Lord Onslow's Committee, had it?—No.

2311. What is your experience as to the way retailers do their business?—Well, my experience is, that the customers do not, as a rule, ask the nationality of the bacon or hams that they require. They select and purchase, as a rule, according to the cut and the taste, irrespective of nationality, and more on account of the price. As a rule, the nationality is never mentioned.

2312. They leave the quality then to the judgment of the shopkeeper, do they?—As a rule, they do; that has been my experience. They presume that the shopkeeper knows more about it. They will ask: Is this a nice piece? He will say, It is; and he probably knows what they are accustomed to as a rule. He knows what they want, and he can recommend the piece they look at, and which they seem to like. He can then recommend it with the confidence that his experience of their wants and requirements gives him.

Chairman—continued.

2313. All they trouble about is the price and the look of the article?—Yes; they also like to have the opinion of those who have had a longer experience than themselves, and they might ask, "Is that a nice piece?" and, of course, the shopkeeper would say he thought it was if he thought it would suit them; if not, he would be doing injustice to them and to himself too.

2314. I suppose, if he recommended a piece which was not nice when they tasted it, they would lose confidence in his judgment?—Yes, sir, they would.

2315. The retailer who knows his business can easily distinguish, can he not, the nationality of the article?—Yes, sir, he can.

2316. Will you tell us anything about that, as to how he knows it?—Well, the general cut and appearance of the different kinds of produce.

2317. What are you speaking of more especially now, hams and bacon?—Yes; or cheese.

2318. How would he distinguish a foreign ham from a York ham, say?—Well, a York ham, of course, is like one of our old-fashioned English cured hams, which he would recognise at once as soon as he saw it. He would know the district it came from, as a rule.

2319. But, with a less superior ham (an inferior ham to a York ham), how would he know the difference between that and a foreign ham?—Well, the foreign ham has quite a different appearance altogether.

2320. It has quite a different appearance?—Yes, sir, it has.

2321. Is it differently cured?—Yes, it is differently

Chairman—continued.

ferently cured, differently dried, altogether; it has a different appearance.

2322. Will you explain to us shortly the difference?—I can show you the difference between an American and an Irish ham. I have brought samples here.

2323. I think it would be interesting to see them, certainly?—(*The Witness produced two sample hams, and explained their differing qualities.*) That, sir, is an Irish ham; as a rule, the skins of the Irish ham are very smooth and well dressed; the flesh also, as a rule, is of a whiter character than the American.

2324. Can we see specimens of the bacon?—I have not brought any bacon; it is cumbersome.

2325. You tell me that you did not bring any bacon because it would be so cumbersome?—Yes, and I was summoned on a very short notice; I was away from home when the summons came, and just rushed off.

2326. From that I take it you would have to bring a large piece (a side, or something like that) to show the difference?—Yes, I should.

2327. You would not be able perhaps to detect the difference in small quantities, would you?—As a rule we can.

2328. In how small pieces could you detect it?—It would have to be a very, very small piece, more like a slice than anything else; if it was a piece that was worth calling a piece, I could detect what country it belonged to.

2329. You could?—Yes.

2330. Is there much difference in the quality of those two hams you have shown us?—Oh, yes, there is a good deal of difference in the quality.

2331. Is the Irish very superior to the Canadian?—Yes, it is, and would fetch a much better price in the market, and is more suitable for a better class of trade.

2332. What would be the difference in price?—I do not sell Irish hams myself, but I will get you the price in a minute of the Irish hams; the sale is more in the London district than the Liverpool district; we do not sell them in the Liverpool district as a rule.

2333. What is it you deal with?—I deal in American hams, Cumberland hams; they are very different looking to the Irish again; we sell them as a rule about six months to 12 months old, they look very different, they have not the newness of look, they are older looking hams.

2334. Do they resemble more the Canadian ham?—No, they are more unlike; they are older looking than those two on the table.

2335. What would be the difference in price between the Cumberland ham and the Irish ham?—They are much the same.

2336. And between the Cumberland ham and the Canadian ham?—There is a considerable difference in price there; you might say there is a difference of 40 shillings a hundredweight.

2337. What would be the weight of that ham, the one on the table?—That would be about a twelve-pound ham.

2338. I hear you have some photographs to show us?—Yes, sir, I have; these are photographs of American cuts. (*The Witness produced the "photographs" and explained the same*).

Chairman—continued.

2339. We have here photographs of the different cuts used in the trade?—Yes, sir.

2340. These are photographs of a placard issued by some American dealers?—Yes.

2341. I see these various cuts are called in many instances by English names?—Yes.

2342. For instance, one cut is called "Cumberland," another is called "Yorkshire," another "Stafford," another "South Stafford," another "Welsh Wiltshire," and another is called "Wiltshire"?—Yes.

2343. I see also at the bottom of the list there are two pieces, one what is called "English square shoulder"?—Yes.

2344. The other is called "New York sheulder"?—Yes.

2345. Now are these pieces of bacon hanging up in your shop with those names above them?—No.

2346. Would they be ticketed with those names in your shop?—No. Well hanging up, of course, they do not ticket. The different pieces in the different localities where that particular cut is sold would, of course, be hanging in the shops, but on the skin of these particular cuts, as a rule there is a brand. The best curers brand their goods with a particular brand. For instance, Fowlers have "James Wright & Co.'s registered crown brand," which is a brand well known to the trade.

2347. But there are no cardboard tickets or signs hanging up in the shops with these names upon them?—Oh, no.

2348. Would it be legal for you to sell a piece of this, say, describing it as "Yorkshire"?—It would not be right to sell it as Yorkshire.

2349. But you call it Yorkshire?—In the trade we know it as "Yorkshire Cut"; but if a customer came in and asked for five or six pounds of bacon, and said nothing about it, and we knew the customer and knew that that was the kind that they had, and they said nothing about the nationality, of course we should cut them what they were accustomed to and charge them the price it was worth; but if they said: "Is this Yorkshire bacon?" we should say: "No, it is not Yorkshire bacon; it is what is called 'Yorkshire Cut,' but it is American bacon."

2350. Are these names in any way stamped upon the pieces?—No, only upon the box. They are stamped upon the box, and they are put up to correspond with the identical cuts that are required in England for the English trade.

2351. Then all that the name means upon the box is that it is cut in a particular way. All that the name of "Stafford" or "Wiltshire" outside the box means is that that is cut in Stafford fashion or Wiltshire fashion?—Yes, to suit the requirements of the trade for those particular districts.

2352. No customer would be deceived by that, because he would not buy it in the box, I suppose?—Oh, no; no customer would be deceived; if he bought it in the box he would see the name as well as the shopkeeper does.

2353. He would see the name as well?—Yes, it is branded "*produce* of America."

2354. The best classes of imports are branded generally by the trade marks of registered brands, are they?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

2355. Why is that?—Well, they have cultivated the trade for those particular brands, and buyers buy them as brands. If they find that a particular brand suits them they of course follow that by giving further orders, and they are then able to place a reliable quality of goods before their purchasers.

2356. Then these brands act as an advertisement?—Yes, sir; that is more of the nature of brands.

2357. Most bacon and hams that are imported come from America, do they?—Yes.

2358. Are those brands any guide to the public?—Not at all.

2359. Why not?—We ourselves never notice them; we know the brand we are selling, but we never take any notice of the brand because we know it ourselves. The customer never notices it. It is only stamped on the back, and they never notice it because it is lying as a rule on the skin side down; but if they asked the nationality of the bacon they would be told it was American.

2360. You say you never notice it yourself; does that mean you would know what the American was without looking at the brand?—Yes, I should know it was a piece of American if I saw it cut in two in the window.

2361. Would you know what particular brand it was?—Oh, no.

2362. Then you do make use of the brand to see from where the bacon came?—If I wanted it. If I was wanting a particular brand of bacon I should see then that I got it; where the shopkeeper would tell me that he did not keep it, that he kept some other cured.

2363. I suppose there is a difference?—There is a slight difference. Some people like one brand, and some people another, and of course the curer that can get the favouritism does the best business.

2364. It might not be all equal in quality?—No, they do not all cure of an equal mildness or saltness.

2365. Is most American bacon of very good quality?—Yes, sir, there is a great deal of it very good.

2366. Is there much inferior?—Well, there are some inferior brands. Of course they get a fair share of coarse meats, but the same thing applies to our own; we have inferior bacon here.

2367. How does the quality compare with that of Wiltshire bacon?—It is more salty; it is not so mildly cured.

2368. Which is the more salty?—The American.

2369. Are there people who prefer it, the American, if they can afford to have the other?—They would prefer the Wiltshire, no doubt, but they would have to pay a very much higher price for it.

2370. What difference is there in price?—I should think there is a difference of about 4*d.* or 5*d.* a pound.

2371. I read in your evidence that you think branding on each piece would be very objectionable to the consumer?—Well, if it was read literally it could not be done, sir; it would be simply impossible to do it. Where you have a busy trade, and everyone cutting bacon as fast as they can cut it, if they had to stamp every slice or perforate it, or in any other way mark it, it would simply stop the trade; and it would be as objectionable to the customer as to ourselves.

2372. I suppose they could issue slices as they do railway tickets?—You could not do it; it is a different thing when you get greasy hands. You could not possibly do it. It could not be done.

2373. Now, your Federation, I understand, objects strongly to the present Bill?—Yes, sir, we do; we object very strongly to it.

2374. Would you kindly give us the grounds of your objections?—Yes. We do not object to the branding of bacon in the way that it is branded now, but we object to the proposals of the Agricultural Produce (Marks) Bill for the following reasons: "It has never been proved, and it is not within my knowledge (I suppose I may say 'my knowledge in reading it') or the knowledge of those I represent, that there is any systematic fraud in the sale of foreign produce. A careful analysis of the prosecutions brought by the Bacon Curers' Association show that the convictions were of highly respectable tradesmen, who may have been proved guilty of some highly technical offence, which, however, involved no question of fraud on the public or dishonesty on the part of the shopkeeper. In some cases, such as that of Mr. Sumner, of Birmingham, it was proved that the Bacon Curers' Association were most absolutely wrong in their judgment of the true quality or source of origin of the article, and the Federation most strongly protest against any private firms forming themselves into a league for the purpose of harassing honest shopkeepers with attempts to get them convicted of technical offences. In witness' opinion, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if the shopkeeper were asked the nationality of the article he is selling, the question would receive a truthful answer, but such a question is not asked as a rule. The poorer class of buyers do not understand the difference between the bacon of Denmark, America, and Ireland, and if they did they would choose that which suited their taste and pocket, without troubling from whence it came. The better class of buyers might sometimes from sentiment inquire for English bacon; but even he is unable to distinguish between real Wiltshire bacon and so-called Wiltshire bacon cured from Irish pigs, and certainly cannot tell the difference between Waterford and Limerick bacon, though the retailer and the wholesale man knows the difference partly from his own experience, and partly from the price he pays in the open market."

2375. Suppose the proposal to register shopkeepers was carried out, do you think that that would be undesirable?—I think it would be an insult to the trade, sir.

2376. An insult?—Yes, I do.

2377. But why an insult?—Well, personally, I do not know why we should be registered in selling any article that comes from abroad any more than any other person in any other trade should be registered too. I do not see why we should be made an exception.

2378. I do not see where the insult comes in, quite?—It would be an insult to the trade.

Chairman – continued.

2379. You do sell foreign meat and foreign bacon?—Yes, we do.

2380. And are not ashamed of selling it?—No; but I think we should be an isolated case of having to register. I think there are other shopkeepers who sell what they know to be foreign goods, silk mercers and people of that kind, and I think they ought to be put under the same conditions.

2381. That might be so?—We should appear to be singled out. I do not think we should be singled out any more than a baker, or anyone else that sells foreign produce.

2382. I only wanted to know where the "insult" came in?—Well, we feel very strongly about it. I am speaking for Liverpool, particularly, and the Federation passed a resolution bearing upon it as well.

2383. Do you think that if you were registered as dealers in foreign bacon that you would be likely to sell more or less of that foreign bacon?—I think that this Bill myself, speaking as an Englishman, would be most detrimental to our own produce.

2384. What, the English produce?—Yes, sir, I do.

2385. May I ask why?—I think it would bring into more prominence the foreign product.

2386. You think it would advertise the foreign product?—Yes, I do.

2387. To the disadvantage of the English?—Yes.

2388. Because the foreign product is cheaper?—It is cheaper, and in the case of beef; of course I am not a butcher, and ought not to mention that, perhaps——

2389. No, we will confine ourselves to that part of the business with which you are acquainted?—Right, sir. I still think it would be beneficial to the foreigner.

2390. You think it would be beneficial to the foreigner with regard to bacon?—Yes.

2391. Please explain?—If this Bill did pass I certainly think that we should then sell more American bacon than we do.

2392. You think you would sell more?—Yes, I think we should. We, the better class as a rule, particularly do not force the American bacon. I may say from my own experience that it was perhaps 15 years after American bacon first came in before I would look at it; but I was forced to sell it to compete with the trade. I used to sell nothing but Cumberland, and I stuck to it till I was selling none at all. Then I had to sell American bacon; not English bacon, but American bacon.

2393. You think you would be induced to push the sale of it?—I do not "think" so; I am sure so.

2394. Why would you do so?—Because I should have a more constant profit; not an extravagant profit, but a more constant profit and less loss. The rough pieces we have to sell of the English produce mean a big loss which we have to make up on the better cuts. On the American article we have not that big loss.

2395. Then you get a steadier profit on the American bacon than you do on the English?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

2396. Then why do you not now push the sale of the American bacon?—Personally, I have an old-fashioned family trade, and I always like to give my customers that article which I think is the best.

2397. Would there be much difficulty about having these marks inspected if the Bill was carried into law; would there be much difficulty in appointing inspectors to see that the law was carried out?—Do you mean to mark every piece that is exposed for sale?

2398. Suppose this Bill became law as it now stands; you know it is not proposed in the Bill to mark every piece, but only sides and large pieces?—Yes, sides.

2399. Would there be much difficulty in seeing that that law was carried out?—Well, I should like to ask the question, would it require, if the law was carried out, the ticketing of every piece exposed for sale, hanging up in a shop we will say?

2400. No. I suppose you have read the Bill?—Well, I have, sir, but I came off in a hurry and did not bring it with me, but I think one of the clauses in the Bill requires that you should ticket every piece.

2401. "The carcases or sides or hams of the animals" are required to be marked under the Bill?—"Carcases, sides, or hams"?

2402. Yes?—Those would have to be ticketed?

2403. No, would have to be marked; it does not follow that they would be ticketed; they might be either ticketed or branded?—The sides and hams of animals at the present time of the best brands are branded. Some of those brands I have shown you are branded on every piece of meat.

2404. Would there be any difficulty in sending an inspector round to see those brands, the brands which are now on them?—There would be no difficulty in sending an inspector to see them, but there would be no use in him seeing them. I do not think that would be any benefit to the consumer.

2405. I suppose if any inspector was sent round he would have to have special qualifications?—Yes, he would. He would have to have a very special qualification to know the differences as well as ourselves.

2406. Do you think that if this Bill was carried the tendency would be to create a prejudice against the foreign article?—It would only be temporary.

2407. In the long run the foreign article would beat the home article, would it?—I think it would. That is the opinion of our trade.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2408. You have very kindly given the Committee; I do not know what you call it?—It is a plate.

2409. An impress plate of your firm; I see it is entitled, "Fowler Brothers, Limited, Liverpool and New York"?—And Chicago.

2410. And the address given on this is, "Union Stock Yards, Chicago, United States of America"?—Yes.

2411. Then, I suppose, yours is as much

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

American as English?—Well, we are an American and English company.

2412. But the chief part of your trade is foreign?—We have a large American trade, and I think we have about one of the largest English trades.

2413. But your American trade is larger than the English?—I am not familiar with what they do on the other side.

2414. Surely you know about your own business. I put a plain question to you: Which is the larger, your American or your English trade?—Well, sir, I think it is about half-and-half.

2415. Then practically the trade you do in foreign products is no more than the trade that you do in English products?—No, just about the same.

2416. I notice that in this paper you have given us the names given to a lot of this American bacon and hams?—Yes.

2417. Amongst other things I notice "Wiltshire." Do you sell more of what is called this "Wiltshire cut," American, or do you sell more of the pure Wiltshire?—We manufacture very little of the Wiltshire cut ourselves; our firm manufacture very little.

2418. Then I think that is an indirect answer to a direct question; you sell more of the American Wiltshire than you do of the English Wiltshire?—No, I did not answer it in that way; we do very little in Wiltshire cut ourselves; in that particular cut we do very little; the bulk of that particular cut that comes to England comes from Canada.

2419. You do very little in "American Wiltshire"?—Very little.

2420. I also notice the "Yorkshire cut." Do you do more in the American Yorkshire or English Yorkshire?—The Yorkshire cut is only put up for the Yorkshire trade in England.

2421. Do you do more in the English Yorkshire or in the American Yorkshire; which do you sell most of?—I think we sell very little Yorkshire cut all through.

2422. You sell very little of the American Yorkshire cut?—Yes.

2423. Then you sell more of the English Yorkshire cut?—We sell more of the Cumberland cut than of all the others put together.

2424. More of the American Cumberland cut?—Yes.

2425. Than you do of the English Cumberland cut?—No, that is put up for England; it is not put up for America at all.

2426. You told the chairman you sold American hams and Cumberland hams?—Yes, I do in my own business.

2427. I am asking you of your own business?—I thought you were asking me of Fowler Brothers. In my own shops I sell it.

Chairman.

2428. What were you replying as to just now when the Member asked you as to your sales?—My own sales I concluded you meant, not the sales of the company.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2429. This is your company?—I am a director of that company, sir, and I have businesses of my own.

Chairman.

2430. Your reply as to the sales of that company, when you said you sold very little Wiltshire and chiefly Cumberland, was as to your own sales in your own shops?—Now?

2431. When you answered Mr. Digby's question a few minutes ago, to the effect that you sold very little Wiltshire, did you mean you sold very little Wiltshire as a director of that company, or that you sold very little Wiltshire in your own shops?—I answered his question on behalf of Fowler Brothers. We sell very little Wiltshire cut and manufacture very little at our factory.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2432. This is Fowler Brothers?—Yes. With regard to the questions you put to me with regard to what I sold, I said I sold American and Cumberland hams in my own business.

Chairman.

2433. In your own business?—Yes. Fowler Brothers do not sell any English Cumberland; I am speaking of English Cumberland.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2434. That is what I was driving at. This company does nothing in English, but is simply and entirely foreign, is it not?—Yes. Theirs is all American manufactured goods.

2435. And this that is called here "Wiltshire," "Welsh Wiltshire," "Yorkshire Cut," "Cumberland," "Stafford," "South Stafford," &c., all the English names, most of them English counties, that is all American meat?—That is all American meat.

2436. Not a scrap of that is really Wiltshire?—Oh, no.

2437. Then practically all that they sell is American; they do not sell any of the article we are here about; we are here most of us as consumers, and it is entirely news to us that this is the case?—It is put up in the various cuts for the various localities in Great Britain.

2438. We (speaking at any rate for myself) if I went and bought something that was called "Wiltshire" I should suppose it was Wiltshire bacon?—But the trade know different.

2439. Perhaps some of these trade secrets will come out?—There is no trade secret about that.

2440. I should just like to ask you: What object has the American firm in cutting bacon in imitation of these English cuts?—Because there are certain districts in England that like it very lean and others that like it very fat.

2441. Then, probably the object would be to facilitate the deception of the customer by doing so?—No, sir, I think I read it the other way. The object is to suit the requirements of that particular customer and district. That is the object.

2442. Do not you think that the customers who buy bacon cut in the fashion of an English county

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

county would be justified in assuming that it was really produced in that county?—No, sir, I do not think he would.

2443. Why not?—Because, suppose you take it in the country districts particularly, they would know their home-cured bacon at once as well as we do.

2444. A gentleman from Ireland, representing an Irish county constituency, and not a farmer, in looking at those two hams, at once chose the American ham as coming from Ireland?—I was quite surprised to think that the gentleman coming from Ireland did not at once choose the one that has the finest appearance, and the best appearance, the best get-up; I should have thought he would have adopted that at once.

2445. Probably the mistake he made would be made by nine-tenths of the Members who represent agricultural constituencies in England or Ireland?—I do not think so.

2446. Well, I do; I think the Committee have very little doubt about that. Then with regard to the hardship of branding; are not bacon and hams branded now?—Oh, yes, just on the skin; for instance, they brand it in this way: "Wright's Crown Brand"; "Produce of America." "Wright's Crown Brand" is branded in the centre, and "Produce of America" underneath. There are many curers that put it up specially for the buyers here, and it is not branded at all, or if branded it is branded with a brand they have registered themselves.

2447. Will you kindly explain to the Committee what hardship there would be in branding in a particular way?—There is no hardship.

2448. I thought you came here to object to that part of the Bill?—I object to slices or small pieces being branded.

2449. There is nothing in the Bill that provides for that?—As I read it, it does, sir.

2450. Will you kindly point out the clause which has that effect (*handing a copy of the Bill to the Witness*)?—This is a dangerous schedule.

2451. I want you to point out the clause in which it says that slices of ham are to be marked?—We think this might be interpreted to include every piece that was on the counter.

2452. It does not say so?—It says, "Every person who shall deal in, sell, offer, expose, or keep for sale, or have in his possession for the purpose of sale, any foreign meat or cheese, as or for British or Irish meat or cheese, shall be guilty of an offence under this Act." Well, I presume that every piece would have to be ticketed.

2453. Practically your fear arises out of the presumption, simply a presumption, that that would be the case?—I do not think our trade would have any objection to the sides being branded as a ham is branded. There is no objection at all to that, but it would be objectionable if we had to ticket every ham hung up in the shop with any particular nationality, because we could not get the tickets.

2454. Your objection is not to what is in the Bill, but to what might be put in the schedule by the Board of Agriculture?—Yes.

Chairman.

2455. I take it your objection is to the schedule, which allows the Board of Agriculture to draw up rules with respect to this marking?—Yes.

2456. You fear that the Board of Agriculture might require small pieces to be marked?—Yes, and that would be impossible; we could not do it.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

2457. I quite understand that you want to make it plain that you and those you represent would not like to have small pieces marked?—No, not at all; we would not object to their being branded as they are now in many of the brands, "Produce of America."

2458. That takes away a lot of difficulty if you have no objection to "the side" and "the ham" being branded. There was one point to which you alluded a good deal in your evidence; that is, that no fraud had been carried on by the trade. I think you alluded in a sort of way to some prosecutions which took place last year at the instance of the Bacon Curers' Association?—Yes.

2459. Do you know why that body prosecuted?—They prosecuted because their inspector certified that he had bought a ham that was sold fraudulently.

2460. They prosecuted because fraud was going on?—Yes; but it was proved that it was not a fraud.

2461. Do you mean that there were no convictions in these cases?—Oh, there have been convictions, I know, obtained by that particular association, but what we complain about is the trade being harassed.

2462. I am on the question now of there being no fraud in the trade; there were convictions?—There have been convictions.

2463. You do not wish to impute that there has been a miscarriage of justice in these cases?—Well, of course, there are miscarriages of justice which cannot be avoided apparently.

2464. But in those particular cases you do not impute anything wrong in regard to the decision which was come to in the court in which these cases were brought?—The decision in that case I allude to in my evidence is considered a case of injustice.

2465. Is that a case of conviction?—No.

2466. I am speaking of cases where there were convictions?—I say I would not for one moment condemn a conviction where a man, say, tickets a piece of bacon "Finest Wiltshire-cured Bacon" or "Finest home-cured," and put that in his window, when it is American produce. I say convict every time you find that out; so far as I am concerned, I don't believe in people doing business on those lines, and it is not the general custom.

2467. But I suppose that all made the Bacon Curers' Association think, or that their inspector had reason to believe, that there was fraud going on?—Yes, I daresay that was so.

2468. You spoke about the retailer being able to easily distinguish without marking. Do you think that, as this association considers it necessary to have inspectors, that those in-

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

spectors are not wanted?—I certainly think they are not wanted.

2469. Then how was it proved that customers took these articles and thought that they were English?—Well, I do not know the way they purchased it; if they did not ask for any particular class of meat, if they did not ask for any particular nationality, but said they wanted a ham and one was offered to them at a certain price and they bought it.

2470. I think in some of these cases where the conviction took place the inspector distinctly asked for English, and the retailer, who I understand from you can easily distinguish without a mark, made the mistake of supplying him with an American one, for which he was prosecuted and convicted?—I think in some cases those mistakes have arisen from the employé not being as familiar with the nationality of the goods he was selling; perhaps he had just received a lot of hams and was told to sell them at 6*d.* or 7*d.* a pound, and in the case of anyone going in and asking what country they came from, he may not have been in a position to tell and may have thought them English or American.

2471. You are aware that he is liable now under the law if he does that?—Yes, sir, I am. At the same time I look upon it as more a technical offence than as fraud.

2472. Of course the law does not look upon it in that way, and we have to live under the law of the country?—Yes.

2473. You told us you (to return not to this company, but to your own business) had to sell American hams or had to sell Cumberland hams?—Yes.

2474. And that the difference in the price was what?—Fourpence or fivepence a pound; 5*d.* is the difference to-day. We are selling Cumberland at 11*d.*

2475. Do you think any of your Federation might make the mistake of selling this American for Cumberland?—No.

2476. You do not think they do that?—No.

2477. Were any of those gentlemen that were prosecuted in your Federation?—Well, I cannot answer that question as I have not asked it.

2478. It is a question, of course, we can very easily find the answer to; you do not know?—No, I do not know myself.

2479. You are not certain they were not in your Federation?—No, I do not know whether they were members of our Federation or not.

2480. You speak for several others. Suppose a customer came in and saw some of this "Yorkshire cut" American, and bought it, I suppose you would not tell him that was not real Yorkshire unless he asked you?—Oh, no, you do not tell the customers that; you show it them.

2481. The probability would be that a vast number of customers would believe when they saw it marked "Yorkshire cut" that it was English Yorkshire?—I do not think they would, sir, there is quite a difference in appearance.

2482. Judging by those two hams none of us could tell the difference. There is just one other question I want to ask you, that is with regard to the effect which any legislation of this sort in your opinion might have upon the British producer. I suppose you are aware that the price of pigs has been on the upward tendency in this country?—Yes.

2483. That has been since the Bacon Curers' Association took up this matter of prosecuting those who sold foreign as English?—I do not think that has affected it at all.

2484. I do not say whether it has affected it at all or not, but I say that upward tendency has taken place since that?—It has.

2485. You cannot deny that; everyone knows that?—No.

2486. With regard to registration, you said something about its being an insult. Yours is practically a grocer's trade; is it in connection with this?—A grocer's trade.

2487. Do you hold a grocer's trade license to sell liquor?—I do at one of my shops.

2488. Do you consider it an insult to have to take out that licence?—No.

2489. Then what would be the difference between that and having to register for selling foreign goods; why would that be more of an insult?—I think it would be an insult to single out the trade.

2490. You tell us you think it would be an insult, and I ask why it would be an insult if it is not an insult to have to take out the license to sell liquor?—You speak about "licenses." I think it says "register." I do not know whether I read it in the shape of a license.

2491. The grocer's license to sell liquor is only a form of registration?—It would depend upon the conditions upon which they wanted us to have it printed up in our shop.

2492. Oh, well, will you kindly say the conditions under which it would not be an insult?—Well, I do not see why we should have to have our places registered. When nearly every other trader is selling foreign goods, I do not see why our trade should be singled out.

2493. It is not you specially; it affects butchers as well?—Yes; but it does not affect a flour dealer who sells nothing but flour, and perhaps only a small portion of it English; he is not hampered with conditions of this kind; he is not questioned as to his supply and demand.

2494. Then practically I take it your answer to my question is that the only reason why it is an insult is because all other trades are not treated in the same way, the baker for instance?—Generally speaking, I do not see that it would do any good, and I think it would be very irritating.

2495. But you do not happen to answer my question when I ask you under what circumstances it would not be an insult?—Well, I do not just catch what you mean, sir.

2496. In reply to a question, you said you did not consider it insulting or irritating to have to take out a license to sell spirits?—That license gives me a monopoly in a certain district. That is another matter.

2497. If those who took out the license, and registered, for foreign goods would have the same monopoly, would that meet your point?—They would have an inducement to be registered; if it was licensing it would be another matter. I should have no objection to a license and a monopoly;

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

monopoly; I think it would be a very good thing; we know the value of licenses and monopolies.

2498. You say if the Bill passed you would be forced to push foreign produce?—I think it would have that tendency.

2499. I think you gave as a reason to the Chairman because there would be better profits?—Steadier profits.

2500. Steadier profits and an even trade?—Yes.

2501. Do those reasons not hold good now?—Well, if you sell nothing but English produce you cannot get rid of the rough pieces without very serious loss.

2502. Is it not the case at this present moment that there are better profits and a steadier trade?—On the English or American, or on both?

2503. On the foreign?—There is a good profit on it, because the price has been so low.

2504. I asked this question; will you please answer: Is it the case at the present moment that there are better profits and steadier trade on the foreign than on the English?—Yes, there are better profits, because the price is low and the English price is correspondingly high.

2505. The same inducement that you say would hold good if the Bill were passed does hold good to those in the trade to push the foreign trade, as if the Bill were passed?—I do not know.

2506. You do not know?—No.

2507. Well, I think the Committee and every one else knows?—It may be so.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

2508. I want you to tell me about the Merchandise Marks Act. How does that affect the trade? Has all bacon got a brand of origin upon it?—On the box.

2509. On the box; not on the bacon?—No, not on the bacon.

2510. The box?—The box.

2511. There is no rule about branding the bacon?—No, only on the box in connection with the Merchandise Marks Act.

2512. You said "American Produce" was on that ham; as a fact, do they put that on?—Some curers do and some do not. We have several packing houses, and we brand them in different ways so that our customers ask for those particular brands when they have once got accustomed to them.

2513. But there is nothing to compel you to put the brand anywhere else than on the outside?—Not at all; *that* is an unbranded Canadian ham; *this* is, of course, an unbranded Irish ham. You get some of the brands in Ireland; Lunnon's, I think they brand all theirs. All those I have seen have been branded "Lunnon's Irish ham," or something of that kind.

2514. Still, from the nature of things, there is no particular difficulty in branding bacon and hams?—Not at all.

2515. If you chose to say they were not to be branded "American Produce," there would be no particular difficulty about it?—No particular difficulty or objection.

2516. We have met with difficulties with

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

regard to frozen meat, but those difficulties do not arise with reference to hams and bacon?—I do not think so; I think there was no objection at all to having the sides branded with the "Produce of America." I do not think there is any objection at all to that.

2517. I want to know about the difference in price. At present do you say there is 5*d.* a pound difference between good English hams and American hams?—Between Cumberland hams and American hams. I am selling Cumberland hams at 11*d.* a pound, and American hams at 6*d.* a pound.

2518. And do you think there is really that amount of difference in the quality of the ham?—Not always; if you get inferior Cumberland ham it is not as good as American.

2519. Take a good Cumberland ham; suppose one came from England, would you be able to sell the one at 5*d.* a pound more than the other?—To old-fashioned people who like the Cumberland ham.

2520. Supposing they did not know anything about it; supposing they were simply buying the thing for quality of ham without considering at all where it came from, would you consider one 5*d.* better quality than the other?—I should myself, because I have a preference for it; I have been used to it. Many people might not, and they might probably ask the shopkeeper which he would buy, which he would recommend; and if he was the same as me, fond of Cumberland hams, he would recommend the Cumberland ham. I should sell the Cumberland ham if both were the same price.

2521. A good many like the dearer thing?—No, if both were the same price we should sell nothing but Cumberland hams.

2522. What I want to get at is this. Suppose there was no country of origin in it at all, but just two hams that came up from the country, but the one 5*d.* better than the other, you ticket your things with a ticket in the shop window according to quality, would you ticket one as 5*d.* dear than the other?—I do not think, generally speaking, that the public would give 5*d.* more; experience tells me that they will not give 5*d.* more. Our sale of Cumberland hams is so small, and of American so large, that it proves what I mean: they buy the low-priced ham.

2523. You think that the 5*d.* difference would be given a good deal on account of sentiment?—Not "sentiment"; on account of the taste of those who prefer them.

2524. A fancy thing and a fancy price?—Yes, certainly.

2525. If you were selling the two without any fancy coming in, would you expect to be able to keep one 5*d.* dearer than the other?—Well, there is always a difference of about 5*d.*; we could not help but charge that, because we have to pay it.

2526. Yes, I was not questioning that; the public will pay what they think the thing worth?—The public, as a rule, will not buy the Cumberland hams because they are large; the American is much smaller; the Cumberland hams are very large hams.

2527. What I want to know is how much you consider this 5*d.* a pound difference is due to

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

sentiment, the one being English and the other American?—It is not a sentiment; there is a great difference in the cost. The Cumberland is very well dried; the American ham is sold, as a rule, comparatively fresh, the same as these on the table; the Cumberland ham is very carefully dried and loses a lot of weight?

2528. Under any circumstances, the Cumberland ham is still dearer than the American ham?—Certainly.

2529. But would it sell for as much as *5d.* dearer?—That is the present difference in price; it would all depend upon the quantity of hams sold in Cumberland the price of the American hams; it might be double nearly; I have known American bacon to be as dear as Cumberland nearly, that was through scarcity.

2530. I want you to explain these names that are here. You have got various names, "Long rib," "Long clear"?—Yes.

2531. "Cumberland?"—Yes.

2532. "Stafford." Does that mean the quality of the pig or the way the meat is cut?—The way the meat is cut.

2533. Then any pig you can turn equally into "Cumberland," "Long rib," or "Yorkshire"?—Yes, any cut that we had a demand for.

2534. It does not mean anything particular about the pig?—Oh, no.

2535. Or the kind of pig?—No.

2536. It is simply the way that you butcher it?—That is so.

2537. On the whole, does "Yorkshire" mean that they like it in Yorkshire cut that way?—Cut that way, yes; the ribs taken out for instance.

2538. In that particular way?—Yes; in the "Cumberland cut" the ribs are left in.

2539. But here in London what do you sell?—The "Wiltshire cut" which you find on the other side of the page.

2540. The "Wiltshire cut" simply means the shape into which it is divided?—That is it.

2541. And not at all the breed of the pig?—Not at all.

2542. Or the place it has come from?—No.

2543. For instance in all parts of England where they are supplying London, where they cut up pigs in that way?—I think that is the cut which is sold in London generally; I have not noticed any other cut when I have been here.

2544. Without any suggestion that it comes from Wiltshire?—Certainly without any suggestion that it comes from Wiltshire.

2545. Or that it is of any particular breed or anything else?—It is Wiltshire-cut bacon wherever it comes from. That is the shape of the flitch or side.

2546. In the same way in Scotland they get Isle of Wight ham; does that mean any particular ham?—I have not seen an Isle of Wight ham; I think I have seen one in a window in Liverpool of a very fancy dealer we have there. It is a very long shank and rather roughly cut, like a home-cured ham.

2547. It is the way you smoke it; the way of curing the thing, is it not, that gives it its character?—This was not smoked; this was a pale ham that I saw; it was unsmoked and it looked to me like what we call a home-cured ham; that is, cured at some English farm.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

2548. But it is the method of cutting and curing that gives it its name?—Yes; I suppose it will be.

2549. Not that which comes from the Isle of Wight?—No; if they cut it up exactly the same they might call it a similar cut to the hams cut in the Isle of Wight.

2550. In the same way anybody who knows anything about bacon would not think that a Wiltshire side meant that the pig lived in Wiltshire?—No, not necessarily; in the trade we do not look at it from that point of view.

2551. In Scotland we have joints that are called English cut; you would not expect people to think that those came from England?—No; a piece of beef may be English-cut, cut from an American beast.

2552. No doubt; I want to know about the bacon here. If you have a piece of bacon without any mark on it at all, can you as a man skilled in the trade say for certain whether it is English cured or American cured?—Generally speaking I could.

2553. If you saw a lump, if you saw a pound?—If it was a piece, say a fair-sized piece, two or three pounds weight, I think I should be able to tell.

2554. You think you could?—Yes, I think I could.

2555. Without any hesitation?—Yes.

2556. Could you so clearly distinguish it (supposing it was a case of swearing in a court of law) that you could swear it was?—Well, you would be very very careful about swearing in a case of that kind; still I think as a rule we could tell the difference.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2557. In some cases you would probably be able to swear?—Yes, at once. In some cases there might be certain indications that would enable you to tell at once, but still you might find other pieces of meat that it would be very difficult indeed to detect just on the spur of the moment, without thinking or knowing anything about it.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

2558. You have told us there would be no objection to branding sides?—Not at all in the way I mean.

2559. If it was merely a question of branding sides and hams nobody would have any objection to it?—None at all.

2560. But of course this schedule provides for rules to be drawn up by the Board of Agriculture in regard to marking?—Yes.

2561. Which none of us have yet seen?—No, sir.

2562. Of course the object of the Bill is to prevent American produce or foreign produce being sold as English?—Yes.

2563. Of course the danger would not come when you were selling whole sides, but when you were selling a half-pound at a time, would it not; if there was going to be any fraud, the fraud would be when you were selling little bits?—Yes; and in as far as you can cover it I think it is

covered

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

covered now. That is to say, if a person comes in and asks the nationality of the bacon——

2564. If you will just follow my questions a little bit instead of going off in your own mind, it will answer my purpose. If there is going to be fraud at all, the danger will be, will not it, when you are just selling pieces of a pound or two; it will be the little men selling the small pieces?—Yes, but I do not think there is any danger.

2565. Supposing there is any danger, it will be there, will not it?—There is no danger, because——

Chairman.

2566. Do not you understand the question: If there is any danger, if there should be any danger, it will be with the small man selling small pieces?—Yes, sir, but still if the customer did ask the seller the nationality, he would answer it, I believe.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

2567. You have given me an answer. Do not go on beyond that. At the present moment I am trying to get out a point that I think would help you if you would be only so kind as to answer my questions?—I am only trying to give the information from my own experience.

2568. If there was going to be any danger it would be in regard to these small pieces; but how would the stamping of the whole side mark one of these small pieces?—How can it; it is cut up into hundreds of pieces; one side.

2569. Do you think it would be useful in preventing fraud unless you had almost every square inch of the bacon marked?—That would be very objectionable; it would be objectionable to the consumer.

2570. You think it would?—It could not be done, sir; it could not possibly be done.

2571. "Sides or hams." I am speaking now with regard to a piece of bacon?—I have no objection to branding a side, if branded like this ham at the back. There is no objection to that; and on the sides as well, none whatever.

2572. So far as meeting fraud you would require, would not you, to have it stamped over so much of the whole surface that it would be pretty difficult?—You could not do it, sir.

2573. Are you acquainted with cheese at all?—Yes.

2574. I was not in the room at the beginning, were you asked about cheese?—No, not to-day.

2575. You are aware that this Bill provides for that?—Yes, it provides for cheese the same.

2576. What is your view about that?—Cheeses that come from America have "Produce of America" or "Produce of Canada" upon them.

2577. On the box?—Yes.

2578. Are they frequently branded on the rind?—No, sometimes there is a date upon them, but very rarely.

2579. Would there be any difficulty about branding them on the rind?—The rind is covered with a cloth; in selling the cheese you have to strip that cloth off, because you cannot cut it with the cloth on; then, of course, the brand would come off with the cloth.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

2580. You can brand the rind of the cheese itself, cannot you? How do you mark cheese?—We do not mark it at all.

2581. Could you mark it; is there any difficulty about marking it?—Oh yes, sir, very great difficulty.

2582. What is the difficulty; supposing you wanted to mark a cheese, how should you set to work to do it?—I have never tried to mark one.

2583. Cannot you stamp cheese?—No; the cheese is so oily and greasy that no brand would be of any use after you used it once or twice.

2584. In business you have not seen cheeses marked at all?—No.

2585. They are always marked on the cloth?—As a rule they are marked on the cloth.

2586. Or on the box?—On the box lately; they have marked them on the box the same as I have on the box here which I have; it has "Produce of Canada" on it.

2587. In your business you have not been accustomed to mark cheese at all?—No, I have never done anything but ticket it myself, except in the case of English cheese, and that I put the country on, as a rule. I have tickets for Cheshire cheese; that is the kind we sell about Liverpool.

2588. As to the cheese, the small piece; the difficulty would come as with bacon?—Yes, and I think it would be very objectionable to mark them with anything like a dye.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2589. Have you never heard of cheese being marked with a press when the cheese is being made?—No, I have not.

2590. Well, we have in this Committee?—I have not heard of it.

2591. You have not seen cheese marked with a stamp?—No, sir, I have not done so.

2592. Well, as a matter of fact, it is put on with a press?—I have not met with it myself.

2593. I want to ask just a question about the sale of these small pieces of bacon in which case fraud is alleged to take place sometimes. How does the grocer keep his bacon in the shop, does he keep it in small pieces or in sides?—Small pieces, he has to cut the side up in small pieces.

2594. In the shop in the morning before the customer comes in is it cut up in small pieces?—Just as it is left the night before.

2595. How is it left the night before?—Just as the grocer has convenience on his counter or on his shelves for placing it.

2596. If a customer comes and asks, say, for two or three or four pounds, would it not be usually cut off a much larger piece and weighed?—Yes, sir, it would.

2597. You would not keep two or three or four pounds lying about?—No; still he might just have a piece which would suit the purchaser.

2598. As a general rule if I went into a shop and asked for three pounds of bacon, the piece would be cut off, would it not?—Unless he happened to have the piece you wanted.

2599. In some cases they would not have it?—In some cases they would not have it; in some they have.

2600. If I wanted English bacon I could pro-

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

bably see that I got it if the side was marked?—You could do it, but if you were to ask for it I think you would get English bacon.

2601. True, but in that case the mark suggested would be a prevention of fraud?—If the side was marked or the piece of ham was marked.

2602. Suppose it was laid down in an Act of Parliament or in a Schedule to an Act of Parliament, that three or four marks should be put on every side of bacon, that would be a prevention against fraud, would it not?—Yes; in the case of Irish bacon it is branded that way; in the Wiltshire case, where it is a whole side of bacon, it is branded on the shoulder, it is branded about the centre of the flitch, and it is branded on the ham.

2603. There is no difficulty about that, I suppose?—There is no difficulty about that.

2604. It would not harass the trade?—No, I do not think that would harass the trade at all; it is an objection when it is cut up.

2605. It is only cut up when the customer comes in?—Sometimes it is cut up ready for sale piece by piece as they come in.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

2606. Can you tell the Committee what the difference in price is between the two hams you have been good enough to bring here for our inspection?—I cannot be accurate with the figures, because I do not sell Irish hams, but there is a gentleman here that will give me the exact price if you want the exact price. I can give the price of American ham to you.

2607. At all events the Irish ham would sell for much higher than the Canadian ham?—Nearly as much again. I think the price of Irish is about 11*d.* in London, and the price of the American ham is about 6*d.*

2608. You have expressed great confidence in the honesty of your trade?—Yes, sir, I have.

2609. Do you think there would be hardly any people found in it that would commit a fraud by misrepresenting the article?—No more than in any other trade.

2610. That is not going very far?—Well, it is, perhaps, not going very far.

2611. I must say I share with you your belief in the general honesty and confidence in your trade; but I do not think there could not be someone found to perpetrate a fraud of this kind. You saw the mistake I made myself between the two hams that you have brought here. Do not you think from that now that if an innocent or unsophisticated person like myself went into a shop and said "I want a good ham," it would be "Yes, we have a good ham," and a good ham would be brought to the counter and given; and supposing it was a Canadian ham like *that*, I would have to pay the price of Irish ham for it?—I do not think that would be your experience, sir.

2612. Do not you think that anybody could be found in the trade to give a Canadian ham for an Irish and put the difference of the price in their pocket?—No, sir; if he did it would be injuring himself and the trade too.

2613. We have examples that people do injure themselves in that way?—Well, we have seen them ourselves and we have seen their end.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

2614. At all events you would have no objection, I understand, that I should have protection?—None at all. I think if you described what would be your experience, that you went into a shop and said, "I want an Irish ham, have you got any," I think you would have the correct answer.

2615. That is not exactly the case I am putting. I put to you the case of an inexperienced person that goes in and asks for a good ham?—If you went in and asked for a good ham, and the shopkeeper had some good Americans and thought from your appearance you wanted a ham about 6*d.* or 7*d.* a pound, he might recommend that; but you would then be to blame for not asking for an Irish ham if you went in for a good ham.

2616. Suppose I was innocent enough not to ask for an Irish ham, but asked for a good ham, would it be right that the retailer should give me a good Canadian ham and charge me the Irish price?—I do not think he would do that.

2617. There is a great deal of human nature; other people may not entertain the same idea as yourself. Do you think it would be fair?—No, it would not. He would not be doing justice to himself or to you, and your faith in him would soon vanish.

2618. It would not be doing justice to me, but I could do nothing until I found out the fraud with regard to himself. You have no objection to branding, if a means can be found of its being done without making it a hardship to the retailer?—Branded on the skin, as I have indicated; I do not think there is any objection in our trade to that. Personally, I have no objection. It is done on Irish bacon; it is done on Wiltshire bacon; and there is no objection to that; but when it was cut it would be simply impossible and impracticable for us to sell it for every piece to be marked.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2619. I understand you are President of the Grocers' Federation?—Yes.

2620. And you represent also the retailers in the country?—Yes.

2621. I suppose your association, and also yourself, are aware that the object of this Bill is, first of all, to benefit the farmer, and also to protect the consumer?—Yes.

2622. Now, do you think that either of these objects will be attained if the Bill becomes law?—Not at all.

2623. Do you think that the farmer would not be benefited?—I express my own opinion.

2624. I am only asking for your opinion?—Then I have a very strong opinion that he would not be benefited.

2625. Supposing there is a difference of 5*d.* a pound between Irish ham and American ham, and this Bill becomes law, and a larger amount of English bacon is consumed, that would be a benefit to the English farmer, would it not?—Yes; and if you were to turn out a large consumption of English bacon the price would go up with leaps and bounds, and there would be none obtainable in a few weeks. It would go

up

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

up by leaps and bounds, and people would have to go on American produce. That is where the mistake would be.

2626. That would be a benefit to the English farmer?—A temporary one only.

2627. I ask you whether it would be a benefit to the English farmer if the price were increased?—It would not; because it would throw it then into the channel of the few consumers, whereas the many consumers——

2628. I am not talking about the consumers just now; I am asking you if the price of English bacon were increased whether the English farmer would benefit by it?—He would get a temporary benefit in the price for his bacon, of course.

2629. That is an answer to my question. If he did get a penny a pound more, we will say, would that penny per pound come out of the pocket of the wholesale dealer in bacon, or out of the pocket of the consumer?—It would ultimately come out of the pocket of the consumer, of course.

2630. Then, in other words, if this Bill were a benefit to the English farmer, it would be at the cost of the consumer?—Certainly.

2631. You think the Bill would be a distinct injustice to the consumers if it caused the article they have to buy to be dearer. Suppose it makes the article consumers have to buy dearer, it would do an injustice to them?—I think it would be an injustice to them; yes.

2632. In connection with your association, have you ever heard any complaint from the customers forming your association that they have been unjustly treated. Have there ever been any cases of fraud by members of your association on their customers which have come to your knowledge?—Not in my own immediate neighbourhood.

2633. No, no?—I have only been connected with the Federation a short time.

2634. You are President of the Federation, and I am asking whether, in your knowledge of the transactions of the Federation, any such case has come to your hearing?—I cannot say anything about it.

2635. So far as the retail grocers are concerned, what is their opinion; do they want this Bill?—No, sir, they do not.

2636. They think there is no need for it?—No. I have a resolution which was discussed at our Federation meeting last year; I have it here; I do not know whether it has been read.

2637. Are you aware that the Bill provides that all persons who sell foreign meat shall be registered as such; in other words, shall be required to have a licence to sell it?—Yes, sir, I am aware of that.

2638. Do you think that that would meet with the approval of the retail grocers?—Well, I do not think that it would unless you take it from the point of view that the Chairman has expressed this morning, that it would give a monopoly to them in the sale of that bacon in the particular district; those who are registered, whereas everybody can sell it who likes.

2639. As far as your knowledge of their views is concerned, do they wish it or not?—They do not wish it; they object to registration.

2640. They wish to have freedom of trade?—Yes.

2641. Now, about this foreign cheese; I suppose you have some experience of that, have not you?—Yes.

2642. Do you think there is any very great difference in the average foreign cheese and the average English cheese?—I think they both have their respective adherents. There is not any difference in quality, the full cream cheese, both American and English.

2643. Is there any great difference in the quality, so far as you are concerned?—No, sir; it is only a question of flavour.

2644. Do you think the ordinary consumers, the bulk of the customers of the grocer, care a straw where the article comes from as long as it is good in quality?—No, they do not.

2645. From your knowledge of the trade, the trade do not want this Bill?—No, they do not.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

2646. Look at that card. Do the Americans call those pieces or cuts by similar names in their own country?—Those are put up entirely for the English market.

2647. All of them?—Yes, all those cuts are for the English market.

2648. If this bacon was bought in America the term "Cumberland," or "Yorkshire," or "South Staffordshire" would not be understood?—If the buyer bought it for the English market it would be understood.

2649. I mean if the American consumer bought it?—They do not use it the same as us.

2650. In fact, this thing is entirely made up for the English market?—Yes, it is.

2651. You told us at the beginning of your evidence that there was a difference of about 4*d.* or 5*d.* a pound between Wiltshire bacon and American bacon?—Yes.

2652. Do not you think (of course, I am not alluding to it in any offensive sense against yourself or anybody), but do not you think it is a very great temptation to small retail traders, if there is a difference of price between the two, to palm off upon the consumer American cut for real Wiltshire bacon?—Well, I have not had any experience.

2653. It is a plain question?—My experience would be, that people who ask for Wiltshire bacon are people who can pay the price, and the shopkeeper would have to meet the demand.

Chairman.

2654. The question is, is there a temptation?—Of course it would be a temptation.

2655. That is an answer?—But I do not think it is customary to be tempted.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

2656. I am not asking whether it is customary or not; I hope it is not customary. I simply asked you whether it was a temptation for the small man, considering he could get such a great difference of price between the two, to palm off upon the unwary customer his "Wiltshire Cut,"

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

which came from America as real Wiltshire. He might drop the word cut, might he not, very easily?—He might.

Chairman.

2657. You answer that it is a temptation?—Yes.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

2658. You told Mr. Digby, I think, that you had no objection to these hams being branded? No, sir, I have none at all.

2659. Or the ones you sell?—No, not the whole ham or the whole sides.

2660. Then why did you describe the registration under the Bill, which is tantamount to the branding, as an insult to the trade if you have no objection to its being done?—Not the branding; I did not say that the branding was an insult; it was the registration in the way that it might be read in that schedule.

2661. Oh, your objection is to having it put up in your establishment?—In shops; it might be on the vans; on the baskets; every vehicle that we convey goods by.

2662. If the Bill was carried out in its entirety and the marking, or registration rather, was inflicted also upon butchers and fishmongers dealing in foreign fish, and poulterers and cheesemongers and all the rest of it, the insult, I suppose, might be considered to be somewhat modified?—Well, it would be, but of course I am only saying what I feel; I think it would be an insult for us to be picked out specially, as if our trade was surrounded with everything that was fraudulent.

2663. I think you spoke about the dealer in flour, or you spoke about the baker?—Yes.

2664. Has not the baker now to be registered; has not he to be licensed?—That is his bakehouse; his bakehouse is under some sanitary regulations, not as to whether he is using foreign or English flour.

2665. I do not know why it is more of an insult to him for it to be supposed that his bakehouse is in an insanitary condition than an insult to you to put up that you sell foreign hams. Do you think there is much difference between the two kinds of insults?—The one is not in connection with the manufacture of the article; it is only in connection with the sanitary nature of his bakehouse, which I suppose the bye-laws of the different districts look after, to see that they are clean. It is a question of cleanliness and health.

2666. When the Margarine Act came into force, was it considered a great insult by the trade?—No, sir.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

2667. To have put "Margarine" on a certain class of goods?—To put it on the counter in a certain condition and have it labelled?

2668. Yes?—No, sir; it was not. I have sold margarine all the time.

2669. It was not considered an insult?—No, sir, it was not.

2670. Then it would only have been an insult from your point of view if you had had it put up in your shop that you were licensed to deal in margarine?—Well, I do not know. I never thought anything about the Margarine Act, and I do not think much about it still. The margarine is different; you can go on selling that off the one tub; you could not mark every half pound or quarter pound of margarine you sold except you put it in different paper.

2671. It is not my business to ask questions about it, but I think you are perfectly wrong in imagining that small pieces under this Bill would be marked?—I think that is the fear. I do not think there is any objection from the trade to branding the sides or hams with the country of origin.

2672. We have got that out. You answered the Member here (Mr. Doughty) about foreign cheese. I could not catch quite what you said. Did you describe it as cream cheese?—Yes, full cream cheese; that is, with all the butter left in it in its manufacture.

2673. You do not mean ordinary cream cheese?—No, full cream cheese; cheese with all the butter in it.

Chairman.

2674. Just two questions only. You have told us that grocers have to take out a license for selling wine?—Yes, sir.

2675. All alcoholic products in England pay either a duty or excise, do they not?—Yes.

2676. Therefore, there is a distinction between that and products which pay no duty or excise?—Yes.

2677. You have answered Colonel Jodrell that there may be a temptation to the retailer to substitute foreign for English goods; you do not believe he often falls into that temptation?—I do not think so, sir; not if he is faithful to his trade.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

2678. No, of course he does not if he is faithful to his trade?—Certainly, and I think he is.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2679. You think grocers are quite as honest as any other traders, do you?—I do, sir.

Mr. ALFRED SAMUEL PAGE, called in; and Examined, as follows:

Chairman.

2680. WHOM do you represent?—Samuel Page and Son.

2681. You are very large cheese merchants, are you not?—We are general provision brokers.

2682. Have you anything to do with the retail trade?—We sell to wholesale merchants and dealers.

Chairman—continued.

2683. You sell to wholesale merchants?—Yes.

2684. Not to retailers?—No.

2685. I understand that you are in favour of the Bill?—I am in favour of marking cheese with the country of origin.

2686. Will you please give us your reasons for that?—The reasons are that, if the cheese is good,

Chairman—continued.

good, there is no reason why the foreign maker should be ashamed to mark it with the country of origin. If it should be sold by a shopkeeper for what it is not, and it is of good value, an injustice is done to that cheese. If it is not as good as the stuff is represented to be, an injustice is done to the higher-priced or higher-valued goods.

2687. You would like the country of origin marked upon every cheese?—Yes.

2688. Would there be any difficulty in doing that?—None whatever, I should imagine.

2689. At present, cheeses are sent over in boxes always; are not they marked?—No.

2690. Many of them are already marked?—No, not always. Each country has a distinctive method of sending cheese. For instance, Dutch cheeses are not packed at all; they are sent loose.

2691. Of course, there could be no mistake made about a Dutch cheese, I suppose, could there?—It would be very unlikely that anyone would make a mistake; they are of an extraordinary shape as compared with other cheeses.

2692. And they are marked a peculiar colour?—Yes.

2693. The rind is coloured a sort of magenta now, is not it?—Yes, some are pale, but most are marked with a red colour.

2694. Is there any imitation of Dutch cheese in England?—I have never heard of any such thing.

2695. Imitations are made of foreign cheeses in England, are they not?—Yes, mostly cream cheese.

2696. Are there no imitations now of Gorgonzola or Camembert in England?—No, I should say decidedly not.

2697. How would you have them marked?—I think they should be stencil-plated.

2698. That mark would be very easilyremoved, would it not?—Yes, it would, but I do not know how else it could be done unless the rind were impressed.

2699. Could they be marked in a press?—It would be possible; in some dairies English cheeses are marked in that way; the rind is impressed.

2700. Do you believe there is any large sale of the foreign cheeses represented to be English?—Well, I have no reason to suppose there is.

2701. You do not think there is any extensive fraud going on of that kind?—There are good and bad shopkeepers, of course, but I have no reason to suppose that to any extent fraud of that nature is committed.

2702. What is the cheese you chiefly deal in?—States, Canadian, and New Zealand.

2703. And any English?—Never, no; or almost not.

2704. Do you think that if your cheeses were all stamped with the country of origin it would increase the price of them?—I do, if they were of excellent quality.

2705. Then you are in favour of this Bill really because you think it will advertise the quality of foreign goods?—Not necessarily. I am in favour of it because I think it is the fairest thing for all concerned.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2706. In fact you want free competition between all different classes of cheese, and you want a stamp on them?—Yes, for each to be sold on its merits.

2707. But is not a great deal of the cheese you buy from abroad stamped?—I buy nothing from abroad.

2708. Well, what you deal in, what passes through your hands?—I do not deal in anything; I sell it as a broker.

2709. It passes through your hands; is not a great deal of that cheese marked?—No.

2710. It is most only marked on the box?—That is it.

2711. Or stamped on the cheese?—The factory is sometimes marked on the cheese, but very seldom.

2712. They do not have special brands, the factories in the colonies; for instance, in New Zealand?—Yes, they all have special brands.

2713. Where is that branded?—On the cases, generally; I have seen the cheeses themselves marked.

2714. How does the best Canadian cheese, for instance, compare in price with the English, say with Cheddar?—The range of prices is tremendous; I mean the uncertainty of the price is very great.

2715. It varies from year to year on the different qualities?—Yes; we have seen enormous differences in prices, and at other times the prices are comparatively close together, according to the make in the respective countries.

2716. Does the price of best Canadian Cheddar ever approach to the price of the best English Cheddar?—No.

2717. What is the average difference, do you suppose, taking one year with another?—Canadian of the highest class might approach within 10*s.* of the highest class of Cheddar.

2718. A cwt?—Yes.

2719. I suppose an ordinary retail grocer, in selling cheese, does not make any distinction particularly between the Canadian Cheddar and the English Cheddar, does he?—I think he does as a rule. There is a habit of selling Canadian or American at one price and Cheddar at another.

2720. What would be the difference per pound. Can you say that?—I can only say my cheesemonger charges me 11*d.* a pound for Cheddar cheese.

2721. That is the best English?—Yes.

2722. What would the same man sell you Canadian Cheddar for?—I do not know. I have never asked him to supply it to me, and he has never given me a price for it.

2723. Would it be 6*d.*, or something like that?—Oh, more than that. The price of Canadian and American cheese has been high this last season, the market price; it would probably be 8*d.* or 9*d.*

2724. Of course you cannot speak much of the retail trade. You are only engaged in that as an ordinary consumer?—Yes.

2725. You prefer the best English to anything that comes from abroad?—Yes.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

2726. Would there be any particular difficulty in marking cheese? Suppose there was a law that the cheese was to be marked, do you think there would be any particular difficulty in doing it, not merely with a stencil but with a stamp?—Well, not being a practical cheesemaker I am unable to say. I may mention that Canadian and New Zealand cheese is of course enveloped in cloth, which cloth is put on, of course, at the time of manufacture.

2727. Under the Merchandise Marks Act, of course all these cheese have on their box the place of origin?—Yes.

2728. I suppose, in the course of trade, they stop in their boxes until they get to the grocer's shop?—Until the grocer wishes to take them out for sale.

2729. In order to sell them?—Yes.

2730. So that when they arrive at the grocer's shop it is obvious from what country they are?—Certainly.

2731. Until they begin to be cut up?—Certainly.

2732. Under the Merchandise Marks Act they are obliged to mark all foreign cheese, are not they?—Yes, on the packages.

2733. On the packages?—Yes.

2734. Is all foreign cheese that comes in all made up according to English shapes and names, is it all Cheddar and Stilton?—You are speaking of hard-coated cheese, I suppose?

2735. Yes, hard cheese?—Yes.

2736. Is the word "Cheddar" a word that is used all over the world?—No, there has been a custom of late years to speak of "Canadian Cheddar" or "New Zealand Cheddar," that is an expression I should never think of using; I do not see the necessity for it.

2737. It does not mean a particular shape?—Yes, Cheddar shape; Cheddar cheese is an upright cheese.

2738. We all know that shape; but is that a word that is used, for instance, in New York, not merely for the English market?—It is a word that would be used anywhere to denote the shape of the cheese; I should speak certainly of a cheese as being Cheddar shaped, not as being a flat cheese.

2739. Do you think the American dealer would understand you; would he use the same word?—Yes.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2740. The method of make as well as the make?—Yes.

Mr. *Parker Smith.*

2741. It is the make of the cheese; no one would imagine it came from Cheddar, would they?—No, certainly not; it is an old industry, and these new countries have made their cheese in a similar shape.

2742. Does much foreign Stilton cheese come in?—The Americans send cheeses which are called "American Stilton," and the Canadians send cheese which they call "Canadian Stilton."

2743. Would the average price of this Stilton much vary from the price of good average English Stilton?—Oh, infinitely; the style of the cheese is not the same; they do not develop the blue mould that the English Stilton develops.

Mr. *Parker Smith*—continued.

2744. Do you consider that is so with all foreign cheeses all round; are there any of the cheeses you deal in that come up to the corresponding English cheese?—Well, we get New Zealand cheese and Canadian cheese of excellent quality; but there is a small proportion of the finest English cheese which, as I have said before, I consider beats everything.

2745. The average is as good; but when you come to the very first quality it is not as good?—Yes, a very small proportion. Then you have got something which will always command a very high price.

2746. You say you see no practical difficulty in having the cheese marked and sold marked?—No.

2747. But then, of course, as you say, you are not speaking for the retail dealers or able to speak for them; but as a broker, from your own point of view?—I am simply giving my own opinion of what is best for the trade at large.

2748. You have as much cheese passing through your hands as anybody, do not you?—No.

2749. There are bigger men?—We have always been largely engaged in the cheese trade, but there are many people in the trade who deal or who import cheese specially; I mean they deal in nothing else practically.

2750. You deal in provisions?—Everything, practically.

2751. Do you deal in bacon too?—Yes.

2752. You heard the last witness being examined about bacon. Have you anything to add or to say in regard to that?—I think certainly all bacon and ham should be branded with the country of origin.

2753. As to the public, I think you pretty well agree with the last witness. However, there is nothing further you would like to say in regard to bacon?—No.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

2754. You are in favour of the Bill?—Yes, I am in favour of the marking of cheese.

2755. Do you think if I showed myself as little of an expert in the case of cheese, as I have in the case of ham, that I should have some means of knowing what article I was getting?—I beg your pardon.

2756. Would you say if I showed myself as bad a judge of cheese as I have done of ham that I should have some means of knowing the article I was buying when I was making the purchase?—That would depend upon the character of the shopkeeper.

2757. I am afraid we must leave the character of the shopkeeper out of the question altogether; I might have an honest shopkeeper; I believe that shopkeepers as a rule are honest men and very honest men?—Yes.

2758. Unfortunately we have some among them who are not so honest?—It would be better for you that the country of origin should be stamped upon anything.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2759. You have told us you are in favour of this Bill, but I have not yet gathered why; you have

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

have not, as far as I understand, given us any particular reason why you are in favour of it. Can you tell us why you are in favour of it?—I was called upon to give evidence with regard to cheese, and I stated that I was in favour of the marking of cheese.

2760. That does not give us the reason why you are in favour of it. To tell us you are in favour of marking cheese does not guide the Committee to any very great conclusion. Can you tell us any reason why?—I have already stated my reason.

2761. What is the reason; I did not catch it?—I said there could be no injustice done to the cheese by marking the country of origin upon it, because if the cheese were good it would advertise it, and if it were bad it would prevent the possibility of a shopkeeper substituting it for an article of higher value and putting the difference in his own pocket.

2762. Well, we will look at that presently; but now, I suppose, cheese generally is bought by a great factor, is it; such as yourself?—I tell you we do not buy cheese or anything else; we only receive consignments.

2763. You only receive consignments. Then, I mean to say the goods are consigned from big people first; are not they?—There are plenty of small people who receive consignments.

2764. Who buy direct?—Who receive consignments or buy direct, as the case may be.

2765. I think the usual course with the grocers in the country is to buy through some agent or person in this country, is it not?—No, not necessarily. They buy of the wholesale men, who buy in their turn of the agents or importers or brokers.

2766. In the case of cheese, when a grocer buys some cheese and receives it he cannot be deceived, can he, as to its place of origin?—Practically not, because neither the agent nor the wholesale man, as a rule, removes it from the original package in which it is imported.

2767. Then it is really marked to him?—Yes.

2768. The cheese is marked, so far as he is concerned?—Yes.

2769. When he receives it he knows from whence it comes?—Yes.

2770. Therefore this Bill could be of no advantage to him, could it?—To the shopkeeper?

2771. To the grocer?—Nor any disadvantage.

2772. I did not say whether it is a disadvantage, but I ask whether you think it would be an advantage to him in purchasing?—Yes.

2773. Which way?—In case the goods were not in their original package.

2774. You told us just now they always come in that way?—I did not say so: I said as a general rule. You may take it that that is practically the case.

2775. Is it the custom of the trade?—It is the custom of the trade; yes.

2776. Is it the custom of the trade to send cheese in the package in which it comes from abroad?—It is almost invariably the custom of importers to do so, I believe. Our customers

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

are in the habit of conducting their business on similar lines.

2777. I suppose if one of your customers were to distribute it in packages without any marking upon it, it would be thought to be something wrong; it would be so unusual that people in the trade would think there was something wrong in such a course being taken?—If the shopkeeper were not an expert in his business he might think so, but I do not think there would be much difficulty in his knowing, if he understood his trade, where the cheese came from.

2778. You mean altogether apart from the box he could tell the cheese?—Yes.

2779. Does it not seem then from that evidence that this Bill would be of no service to the grocer in purchasing?—It would be a service to the grocer in this way; it would remove all trouble from his mind.

2780. Do you think the grocers of the country are in any trouble about the source of origin of what they buy?—I do not know; I do not know what proportion of them are experts in their business.

2781. Is it very probable, seeing it is a custom of the trade that all cheese should be marked on the box, that any grocers are troubled in their minds about the article they are buying?—I do not know that it is probable.

2782. Do you think then that this Bill can be of any real service to them in the purchasing of cheese?—Yes, I think it will be of service to them.

2783. Kindly tell us why; I have put the question three times to you?—I have said that it is possible that the cheeses are not sold to them in their original packages. Supposing a wholesale dealer were to take a cheese out of the original package because he was pressed for room, all the original packages put together and the cheeses put together as English cheeses would be, then I say the country of origin stamped on the cheese would be a protection to the shopkeeper who was buying it.

2784. Suppose you have them stamped and some dishonest man scratches the mark out and sends them away, is not the grocer in exactly the same position again?—Yes; but then you propose to mark these, and I take it that anybody erasing the brand or the country of origin would be subject to be dealt with.

2785. I suppose he is now, is not he?—But if there is no brand he cannot erase it.

2786. But there is the box?—No, there is no box.

2787. Then we may take it all the real advantage this Bill will be to the grocer is just this bare probability of some dishonest man sending him cheese in the wrong box. That is the advantage you think it would be to the grocer?—No, it would prevent the possibility of him being cheated.

2788. I will take that as an answer. You told us a moment ago that the chief object you thought would be that everybody should have fair play?—Yes.

2789. That in bringing them they should know what they were bringing?—Yes.

 2790. How

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

2790. How is this Bill going to help the consumer in knowing exactly what he is going to buy; how is that going to be accomplished?—Supposing the consumer has a fancy to buy New Zealand cheese, and he asks for New Zealand cheese, the shopkeeper must provide him with it or suggest to him taking the cheese from some other country.

2791. Is not cheese put up in small pieces. Suppose it is 2 lbs. that he asks for, that probably is more than a small man buys at a time?—Yes, I suppose it is.

2792. Would you have the grocer who supplies it have a brand to put "New Zealand" on that?—No.

2793. How would you insure that the customer knows?—You cannot insure it at all.

2794. Then, in your opinion, to the consumer this Bill would be no protection?—It would be up to a certain point; it would insure the whole of the cheeses being on show in the cheesemonger's shop for what they are. I take it the shopman goes up to the cheese and cuts the cheese.

2795. Are not they often on show now with the country of origin upon them; you go into a large grocer's shop and you see large numbers of cheeses in boxes at times, do not you?—No; probably the shopkeeper has a side warehouse; he would not wish to hamper up his shop by putting the packages in as well as the cheese.

2796. Can you suggest any addition to this Bill whereby persons buying small portions of cheese should have it made absolutely clear to them what they are buying; can you suggest anything to us to help us?—I cannot suggest anything without greatly harassing the shopkeeper.

2797. You know a great deal about retail grocers, do not you?—I do not know anything about retail grocers, because I am not a grocer.

2798. I wanted to ask you whether you thought the public were being defrauded, speaking I may say generally; do you think the public are at present being defrauded by grocers?—You say "grocers," do you say that in distinction to cheesemongers?

2799. I mean persons who sell cheese retail?—Cheesemongers?

2800. Yes?—Not to any great extent, I should imagine.

2801. You think they are as honest as the average class of tradespeople?—Or any other people.

2802. And therefore, if that is so, is there any very great need for this Bill after all?—Yes, certainly; I think, for the reason that I have stated, that it is better to insure a thing (or insure as near as you can) going to the public for what it is.

2803. In other words, you think the public would like to know whether their cheese was made in New Zealand, in Australia, or in England?—And is entitled to know if it wishes.

2804. Do you think the average cheese-buyer, say a mechanic, or any one of that kind, cares 10 straws whether his cheese comes from New Zealand or from England as long as it is food?—No, I do not.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

2805. Then what protection is it going to be to him; he does not care, you say?—Probably he would not want any protection; but "the public" is not all mechanics.

2806. No, happily they are not. Now, about the price. A little while ago I think you said, did not you, that if this Bill became law it might increase the demand for British-made cheese. I ask you this: Do you think if this Bill became law it would increase the demand for British-made cheese?—I believe that it would increase the demand for the fine British-made cheese.

2807. Do you think it would increase the price for fine British-made cheese?—If it increased the demand for it the increase of price would follow.

2808. Would the cheesemonger be at the loss of the difference of price or the consumer; would the consumer pay a bigger price?—If the consumer buys a thing and the price increases, of course, he pays the extra price.

2809. Then your desire, to put it very plainly and in common language, is to tax the consumer in order to increase the profit of the cheese producer in England?—Not necessarily.

2810. Is not that the ultimate outcome?—Not necessarily.

2811. I understood you to say you deal in English cheese entirely?—Oh, dear me, no.

2812. Still my question is just the same?—I do not sell English cheese at all, you may take it; occasionally I have sold it, but I do not profess to have any.

2813. After stating as you have done that the price will be increased if the demand is increased, I want to know from whence the difference in price will come; will it come from the cheese merchant or from the consumer?—Which cheese merchant?

2814. Any cheese merchant; I do not mind who it is?—What do you call the cheese merchant, the man who makes the cheese or the man who imports the cheese?

2815. There are three classes of persons, I suppose; there is the person who makes the cheese, there is the person who buys the cheese, and there is the person who consumes the cheese; now if a larger price is paid for the cheese to the producer some one is going to have to pay the difference in price; who is it?—The consumer.

2816. The consumer, yes, then I repeat my question to you; you wish to tax the consumer, and make him pay a larger price for his cheese in order to benefit the cheese-producer?—I do not wish anything of the kind.

2817. Is it not the outcome?—It must follow as the night the day that if the demand increases the value of the thing itself must increase.

Chairman.

2818. I take it that you do not wish to increase the sale of English cheese, as against foreign, do you?—Not particularly.

2819. You deal in foreign?—Chiefly; almost altogether.

2820. I thought *you said entirely?—Yes;* almost altogether.

2821. You

Chairman—continued.

2821. You would naturally not like to depreciate your own business?—No, but I should not allow that to affect my opinions.

2822. You believe, speaking as a very large cheesebroker, that the result of this Bill would be to benefit the trade in foreign cheese?—I believe that the result would be to benefit the trade in under-priced cheese of good quality.

2823. In low-priced cheese of good quality?—Under-priced.

2824. May I ask what you mean by that "under-priced"?—That is to say I do not think that the higher class cheese would be affected, but I consider that if a person makes cheese of very good quality it would be a very good advertisement for his cheese if the cheese were branded with the country of origin.

2825. You think that the advertisement would benefit the trade in foreign cheese?—It would benefit the trade in the cheese that was good.

2826. I take it that the very best and highest price cheese of all is English?—Not necessarily, but as I have said before, the highest class cheddar cheese has never been beaten.

2827. But the under-priced good cheese is chiefly foreign?—There is a large quantity of English cheese also which is under-priced, and, in fact, quite a large proportion.

2828. If the Bill was passed do you think you would do more trade in these foreign cheeses than you do now?—I, personally?

2829. Well, do you think that more trade would be done in foreign cheese. It is a plain question. What is your opinion?—Not necessarily. As I said before, if it were insured that cheese went to the public for what it was it would most certainly ensure a better demand for good cheese than if it were sold as a higher-priced thing, and the shopkeeper put the difference in his pocket.

2830. You mean good foreign cheese?—Yes, or colonial.

2831. My question is not whether it makes good cheese sell better; do you think it would sell more foreign cheese?—Foreign or colonial.

2832. Foreign or colonial; that is what I mean?—Yes.

2833. You think that foreign and colonial cheese would be benefited by the passing of this Bill?—Good cheese, yes.

Chairman—continued.

2834. Good foreign and colonial?—Yes.

2835. Is there more good than bad comes?—Yes.

2836. Then the foreign and colonial trade would be benefited by the passing of this Bill?—It might be, and I think it would be.

2837. In your opinion it would be?—Yes.

2838. Then, in your opinion, that would decrease the trade in English cheese?—Not in the best.

2839. No, we will put the best out of court; not all, but "the best"?—Well, if it increased the trade in the other it would follow that it would decrease the trade in English.

2840. So that it would hardly be to the advantage of the British cheese-producer to pass the Bill?—It would if he made excellent cheese, and maintained a high standard.

2841. It would only be to the advantage of the man who produced the very best cheese then?—That is my opinion.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

2842. I would just ask you a question as an ordinary consumer. You said just now, in answer to a question of mine, that you bought for your own use the best cheddar cheese, very often?—Yes.

2843. If this Bill passed, and all cheese were marked, the cheese that you sell would be sold generally for what it was, Canadian cheese for Canadian cheese, and English cheese for English cheese. Then I do not see how the consumer would be prejudiced, because assuming that in some exceptional cases Canadian cheese is sold as English at an English price ——?—By a dishonest tradesman.

2844. By a dishonest tradesman?—Yes.

2845. The consumer would not be prejudiced by the passing of this Bill; he would continue to pay the same price, only he would get a genuine article instead of a non-genuine article?—Quite so; he would be protected to that extent.

2846. It would not hurt his pocket in the least doing it?—No.

2847. He would be paying the same price, and instead of getting Canadian cheese at an English price on which the grocer could put 3*d.* or 4*d.* more per pound into his pocket, he would get the genuine article for the same price?—Quite so.

Mr. R. CHALLINOR, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

2848. YOU represent the interest of the Cheshire cheese industry, I take it?—Yes, sir, I do.

2849. You are a Cheshire farmer, are you?—No, I am not a farmer. I occupy the position of secretary to the Cheshire Dairy Farmers' Association. The association perhaps has a membership of about 350. The majority of them are farmers and principally cheese makers; also I was asked to represent the opinions of the Cheshire Farmers' Club with reference to two clauses in the Bill, Clauses 5 and 15.

2850. Do you mean the clauses as to the Birkenhead beef?—Yes, British meat.

Chairman—continued.

2851. Are you opposed to the Bill or in favour of the Bill?—I think, as far as I am concerned myself, I am in favour of the Bill; and I think that probably 19 out of 20 of the gentlemen I represent would be in favour of the Bill with some slight amendment as to those Clauses 5 and 15.

2852. Are you acquainted with the gentleman who gave evidence for the Wirral Farmers' Club?—I am not acquainted with the evidence he gave; I think I have seen it in print, that is all.

2853. I take it you concur with the Wirral Farmers' Club?—Yes, practically; I concur with him with regard to those two clauses.

Chairman—continued.

2854. Well, will you give us any special reasons that you have for desiring to see the Bill passed?—The reasons are, of course, that it is thought dairy farmers who are engaged in the cheese industry think it is only fair that Cheshire cheese, when it goes into the market, should be sold as Cheshire, and that in no case should foreign cheese be permitted to be substituted for and sold as Cheshire. I do not wish to make any sweeping charges against the provision merchants or the tradesmen who deal in Cheshire cheese, or in foreign cheese; I have been in conversation with a good many of them, and from the talks I have had with them, and from observation and several years' experience, I believe that 75 per cent. of them would not, under any circumstances, substitute foreign cheese for Cheshire; but there is on the other hand the remaining 25 per cent. that would do it under any circumstances, if they could make a little extra profit by it. Of course, it hangs upon that. It is for the purpose of making it a little easier for the 25 per cent. to do right, and a little more difficult for them to do wrong, that the Cheshire farmers would like to see this Bill passed, especially with regard to the branding of foreign produce.

2855. You know that anyone who sold foreign meat as English now would be brought under the law as it now stands?—I am quite aware of cases where it has been done recently. I was speaking to a farmer the other day in the Wirral district. He told me that a gentleman accosted him one morning and asked him why it was he could not get good Cheshire cheese just now. The farmer said he thought if he would only put himself in the right way he might easily get good Cheshire cheese now, for there never was better Cheshire cheese made than at the present time. He was asked as to where he had been getting it from. Well, the farmer said in conversation with the party referred to, only a few weeks ago he told me that he had not had a bit of Cheshire cheese in his place for three or four years. The gentleman said he had been sending written orders for Cheshire cheese; and he had been receiving something else, of course, as a substitute. That is one case; and, of course, I could relate many others; and in further talks with some of the unprincipled (I call them) tradesmen, the 25 per cent. have been glaring enough to tell me point blank, that if they can make an extra penny a pound profit they have no hesitation in substituting foreign for Cheshire, if anybody comes into their place of business and asks for Cheshire.

2856. Is this foreign cheese, which is substituted for Cheshire, made specially to imitate Cheshire?—Well, perhaps, it imitates the cheddar more than it does the Cheshire.

2857. In the case in which he could not tell the difference, what this gentleman had been supplied with was really a foreign cheddar cheese, was it?—It was a foreign cheese of some description; either Canadian or American or some other kind; it was not Cheshire.

2858. Would the present law touch that, do you know?—I am not quite sure on that point.

2859. I ask for information; of course I do not know myself?—There is a difficulty in following up prosecutions of that kind and bringing it home.

2860. If the shopman had distinctly said, "This is English made," we know that the law would touch that. If he sold it as English when it was really made abroad and was not English-made at all we know that the present law would control that, and that he would be punished under the present law; do you know whether that applies to the word "Cheshire"?—I do not know; I could not say if that is so.

2861. Has this trade in foreign cheese caused any great loss to the Cheshire producers?—Yes. Of course as a rule we find that they do not even substitute the best foreign cheese; whenever it is the case that they do this they substitute an inferior article, and that of course gives the Cheshire a bad name, and that is what we have to fight against very strongly at the present time.

2862. Can you tell me at all whether Cheshire has suffered more in that way than cheddar?—Well, I could not say; I should think cheddar has suffered quite as much as Cheshire upon that point.

2863. Is there anything more you would like to bring before the Committee in your principal examination?—I was only told of the case of margarine; the present system I think is rather ineffective.

2864. But that does not come under our Bill, I am afraid?—No. Then with regard to Clause 5, I think I have something to say on that point.

2865. That is the registration?—The registration. The bulk of the farmers think that that hardly goes far enough. That dealers in foreign meat (if they of course choose to deal in foreign meat) should not be above allowing a signboard to be affixed to their establishment notifying to consumers and all their customers that they did deal in foreign meat.

2866. Then in addition to registration, which I suppose would probably involve a licence, you would like them to have a board put up?—Yes, a sign.

2867. Notice or a sign?—Yes, in their shop or on the window, indicating that they are dealers in foreign meat as well as British. Then, again, with regard to the cattle described as "British cattle," those bred in the States, reared in the States, fed in the States, and then brought over to this country and killed, the farmers cannot see that they can really be described as "British meat"; to all intents and purposes, as far as they can see, it is foreign meat and simply British killed. If those two clauses were, I think, in some way or other amended, something in the shape of what I have described, I think the bulk of the agriculturists in Cheshire, at all events, would be very strongly in favour of the Bill.

2868. Do you think it would send up the price of cheese?—The price of Cheshire cheese?

2869. Yes?—Well we are not prepared to assert that it will. I have no doubt that the best of the Cheshire cheese would go up in price.

2870. Did you hear the last witness?—Yes.

2871. Do you agree with him that it might increase the sale of foreign cheese?—I do not think

Chairman—continued.

think so. It is possible that there may be about 80 per cent. we will say of the consumers of cheese in this country, and other foreign produce, that are not particular what meat or cheese or bacon or anything else they buy; but there is 20 per cent. probably of the consumers of cheese who would not buy any other cheese than home-made cheese, British cheese.

2872. If you heard the last witness you would realise that he was a large broker in foreign cheese?—I could not very well catch what he said; he was rather inaudible.

2873. He was a large broker in foreign cheese. He was in favour of passing this Bill, and thought it might possibly increase the sale of foreign cheese if this Bill was passed. I assume that the associations which you represent would hardly be in favour of the Bill if they thought that that would be its result?—Well, I think the idea of associations I represent is "fair play and no favour."

2874. So was his?—They believe in competition, but open and square competition. They do not believe in the substitution of these foreign stuffs for good English, and the consumer paying, of course, the Cheshire price for it; for instance, finest Cheshire cheese is always worth ten to twelve shillings per hundredweight more than the best foreign, either Canadian or American, or New Zealand.

2875. Would it be an advantage to the producer of cheese to have it marked if it increased the sale only of the very best quality and diminished the price of all medium and inferior qualities?—Well, it would form a stimulus to those who produced the inferior qualities to emulate the others who produced the finest. I do not think there would be any disadvantage in that respect.

2876. There would be an advantage to the consumer, in fact, but there might be a disadvantage to the producer?—I do not think so.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

2877. You are secretary of the Cheshire Dairy Farmers' Association?—Yes, I am.

2878. You have told us you are not a farmer?—Yes.

2879. But as secretary of that dairy association you have had a great deal of experience, and constant experience of the sale of Cheshire cheese?—Yes, I have.

2880. You act as superintendent, we may say, of sales throughout the year?—Yes; I came fresh from one on Wednesday last.

2881. Will you just tell the Committee where those sales take place?—We have what we call monthly sales, one at Chester and one at Nantwich. It is my business to attend those fairs, and to report the state of the fairs.

2882. The state of the market?—The state of the market.

2883. What amount of cheese passes through your hands on an average at each fair?—The pitch this time of the year both at Chester and Nantwich would be something like 55 to 60 tons each fair.

2884. That at this time of year would bring it up to over a hundred tons a month?—Over a hundred tons a month; and if you take Whitchurch in (which is under the supervision of another), probably there is about 60 or 70 tons at this time of the year per month.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

2885. All that is entirely home-made cheese?—All, without any exception.

2886. Without exception it is all produced from the land round those places?—Yes.

2887. You said in the course of your evidence that white Cheshire and white cheddar are very much the same in appearance, I think?—Yes.

2888. To the casual observer?—"To the casual observer." What they call a "close-meated Cheshire" would resemble very much the cheddar.

2889. I suppose the American and the Canadian cheeses are the ones which enter most into competition with Cheshire cheese?—The Canadian. The Canadian is our sharpest competitor just now.

2890. And has been for 10 or 15 years past, has it not?—And has been for some years.

2891. Is that as distinguishable, or as indistinguishable, to the ordinary eye from the real Cheshire as cheddar?—The Canadian, you mean.

2892. The Canadian?—No, it could be substituted very easily, and sold to the ordinary consumer either as Cheshire or cheddar; that is, as a substitute for our uncoloured cheese.

2893. Is there any coloured cheese that comes from Canada?—I do not think so; we get it from New Zealand occasionally; they make coloured cheese there which resembles the Cheshire coloured very much.

2894. There is no reason, I suppose, why the ordinary consumer should not be taken in by the appearance of the cheese. There are many cases in which he would not know whether he was buying Cheshire or Canadian?—No, but as a rule they do not substitute the cheddar (if it is the finest cheddar) for Cheshire; they would not do that on account of the price.

2895. No, I do not say that. I am simply speaking of the three descriptions of cheese, which are all very much alike to the ordinary observer?—Yes.

2896. Do you consider that the pressure upon the trade now from the import of foreign cheese, Canadian, and so forth, is greater, or is it less, than it was 15 or 20 years ago?—Well, it is very much greater than it was from Canada at that time.

2897. I do not care where it comes from?—Formerly, of course, they used to import very much the larger supplies from America (the States) but of recent years I believe a good deal of the American cheese has been consumed in the States and that has doubled the import from Canada to this country. I forget now the exact figure, but I think it is over fifty thousand tons a year we get from Canada.

2898. I am not sure that you understood my question. I will put it in another way. Do you consider the pressure now on the Cheshire farmer in the way of his cheese-making is greater than it was; do you consider that the trade is greater now owing to imports from the States or Canada;

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

Canada; is it greater now than it was 15 or 20 years ago?—TLe competition is greater.

2899. Is there better cheese made now throughout as regards the generality of it than was made some years ago?—I think the last 10 or 15 years it has gone on gradually improving year by year. If we may take as evidence Chester, Nantwich and Whitchurch shows, probably not less than 60 to 70 tons of cheese are exhibited in small lots, competing for prizes at each show. During the last two or three years at all events it has been so. Factors in the trade have given me their opinion on the matter, and from year to year they state that the Cheshire cheese trade is improving. Last year, for instance, the impression, I think, ran right through the minds of the whole of the trade that there never was in the history of the Cheshire cheese trade a finer lot of exhibits brought together than at the Chester show, and at Nantwich, too, only the show was not on so large a scale.

2900. Then surely all that must tell in favour of the farmer against the competition from America, must it not?—Yes.

2901. If there is all this excellent and very good cheese thrown upon the market it all tells n favour of the farmer so far as that is concerned?—Yes.

2902. The question is for the purposes of this Bill; does it tell equally upon the minds of the public, the consumer, the purchaser?—I think the great bulk of the consumers are always in favour of getting Cheshire cheese if they can get it at a fair price in preference to foreign. Of course the farmers do not object to the consumer going into the provision merchant's shop and asking for Canadian or American and getting what he asks for. What they object to is going into a provision dealer's shop and asking for Cheshire and the dealer substituting American, which has often been the case.

2903. Without telling them?—Without telling them.

2904. What is the difference in price (can you tell us about that) in the retail shop between the different qualities?—Between, you mean, what the farmer gets as the producer.

2905. No, what the retail dealer charges?—The difference in the price between the Cheshire and the Canadian?

2906. The difference in the price between Cheshire and Canadian?—It would be from a penny to three halfpence a pound, perhaps twopence.

2907. In favour of the English?—In favour of the English; for what we call the best dairies.

2908. I think even to the ordinary observer they are so closely related to each other in appearance that it is difficult for the ordinary customer to know exactly by his own knowledge what he is purchasing?—Yes, he must be almost an expert to do it.

2909. Have you any means of knowing or of speaking as to whether there is a great deal of, I suppose I must not say "fraud," but substitution of American for English cheese carried on?—Yes; although as I said before, from my conversation with gentlemen engaged in the trade, I should say that 75 per cent. of them would be above that kind of thing; the other 25 per cent., for the sake of increasing their profit, would adopt almost anything to secure it.

2910. Is there much Australian and New Zealand cheese brought into the district you have to deal with?—Not much. I think the bulk of that either goes to the North (Glasgow and district) or to the London market.

2911. The Cheshire cheese trade and the cheddar cheese trade occupy entirely different areas, do not they, where they are sold?—Yes, they do.

2912. The cheese produced by Cheshire is mainly consumed, where?—It is sold in the Lancashire and Yorkshire district, right away up in the North. For instance, at our fair on Wednesday we had buyers from all the Midland towns, all the Lancashire, Manchester, Crewe, Liverpool, and all the other large Lancashire towns, also the principal Yorkshire towns right up to Newcastle-on-Tyne; several tons, I know, went up there.

2913. There is not much sold in London, in the South?—No, I understand from a friend of mine who is in the trade that he is attempting once more to find some clients in London, and he was telling me the other day that he had been very much more successful than he anticipated, and he does not despair of opening up a profitable trade in London.

2914. So that the evidence given before this Committee which was collected from the South of England and from the London districts would hardly be a fair indication of the way in which the Cheshire trade might be affected by foreign importations; I mean the people in London and the South of England would probably not know enough about the Cheshire trade in order to speak to the foreign competition with certainty, as it affects the Cheshire trade?—No; Cheshire appears to have pretty nearly lost the London trade. I was told some time back by an expert in London, we had a connection with the North, and our better plan was to keep them well supplied (so that we would not allow the Canadian or the Yankee to come and take our clients off us in the North) and to leave London alone, and I am inclined to think he was right. With the Canadian cheddar we have no chance at all of competing, on account of the price; the price is much lower than we can sell our best cheese for. London has a limited demand for our very finest cheese, for which it will pay a good price.

2915. The very finest cheese. The generality of it is consumed in the North, and it is for that reason, I suppose, that we enter so much into competition with America and Canada?—Yes.

2916. Because of so much cheese being sent to Liverpool?—Yes.

2917. There it enters at once into direct competition with our own?—Yes.

2918. You mentioned just now the term "Canadian cheddar"; we had some evidence the other day as to the nomenclature of these foreign made cheeses. They do profess to make cheddar in Canada, and call it "cheddar," do not they?

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

they?—Yes; it is what they call "Canadian cheddar."

2919. The "Cheshire" is never disfigured in that way is it?—No, not at all.

2920. Is it all "Cheshire"?—Yes, we stick to our colour.

Chairman.

2921. In America they do not make any cheese they call "Cheshire," and send over as "Cheshire"?—I am not aware of it if they do.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2922. Do I understand you to say that you attend a fair about once a month, at which 120 tons of cheese are sold?—Yes; two fairs, not one, at which 120 tons would be sold.

2923. Each?—No, between them.

2924. The two?—Yes.

2925. And another fair the pitch is about 60 or 70 tons?—About 60 or 70 tons.

2926. That is about 190 tons a month?—Yes.

2927. Is that considered to be the out-put of Cheshire cheese?—Oh, dear, no.

2928. Per month?—Per month, oh, no. The great bulk of the cheese goes direct to Manchester, or to other centres of trade in the North of England.

2929. From the makers?—Yes; the very finest cheeses never come to our fairs at all. The finest dairies have no difficulty at all in disposing of their cheese at the top prices through the ordinary channel offered for their distribution.

2930. Do you know whether there is more Cheshire cheese made now than was made 10 years ago?—I should say so, a great deal more, for this reason, the farmers are farming on a very different scale to what they were 10 or 15 years ago.

2931. You think the increase in the make of Cheshire cheese has been very considerable during the last few years?—I think so.

2932. Have you any figures, or are there any figures anywhere to be had that would give that increase year by year?—There are, I believe, figures that would give a rough estimate, but I could not speak from memory just now as to what they are; but I should think there would be not much less than 20,000 tons of Cheshire cheese, at present, turned out in a year.

2933. How much should you think it has increased during the last 10 years?—I could not say; I should think 15 or 20 per cent.

2934. Twenty per cent.?—I should think so.

2935. Now, as to the price, do you think there is any difference in the price of the best Cheshire cheese now and the best Cheshire cheese 10 years ago?—Well, the prices fluctuate very much at certain times of the year; for instance, at the beginning of this year, for three or four months, cheese was at a very high price and dealers were very often remarking that that was doing an injury to the trade, that it was pushing them a little off Cheshire on account of the price being a little out of reach and necessitating going on to America.

2936. Is it not the fact that the average price of Cheshire cheese for the last two years has been greater than it was in any two years for

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

the last 10 years; the average price, taking it all through?—No.

2937. You do not think so?—Last year up to a certain time of the year, say up to August, prices never were so low for all kinds of cheese.

2938. Then?—Then, up to August; then they began to increase in September, and by Christmas they were perhaps higher than they had been for several years.

2939. Is it not usual that Cheshire cheese is lower in price the early part of the year?—Not the early part, the middle part of the year during the very hot months, when it is so very difficult to store the cheese and keep it in proper condition.

2940. Do you think that Cheshire cheese makes less per pound now than it did, say, 10 years ago?—If I had my record of the fairs here I could tell you exactly what the price was nine years ago at least.

Chairman.

2941. Has the price gone up?—No, I should think the prices are lower now than they were 10 years ago.

Mr. *Doughty.*

2942. You think they have not maintained their position?—I do not think so; not if you take the average.

2943. How much should you think the difference is?—I should think now they are lower by five shillings.

2944. Five shillings a hundredweight?—Yes, taking the average of what they were a certain number of years ago; but I cannot exactly fix upon the year that I have in my mind just now.

2945. I think you told us there were about 50,000 tons?—About 20,000 tons.

2946. Did I understand you rightly that you said there were 50,000 tons of foreign cheese imported?—Last year or the year before it was between 50,000 and 60,000; I do not think it varies much any year. Over 100,000 tons of cheese is imported from foreign counties altogether. I was referring to Canada only when speaking about 50,000 tons.

2947. How do you prove that this 50,000 tons of Canadian cheese comes into serious competition with you. If, on the one hand, there has been a great increase (say 20 per cent.) in the production of Cheshire cheese, and it has maintained about the same price all the time, where does the competition come in?—It has not, of course, maintained the price; I think I stated that in my opinion it was something like an average of five shillings less.

2948. You do not give any very decided opinion about that, do you?—No. I could give a decided opinion with regard to four or five years ago, but I cannot go so far back as 10 years ago; I think it would be quite 5*s.* or 6*s.* lower.

2949. We might leave the price for a moment, if you like, out of consideration. Notwithstanding this great increase in the quantity of cheese coming into the country to the extent of 50,000 tons from Canada, in the case of Cheshire cheese, which is a large portion of this trade, in the last 10 years there has been an increase?—You misunderstand

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

misunderstand me. I wish to put myself right on that; there has been an increase from Canada, but there has been a decrease from America. I believe America used to send over between 50,000 and 60,000 tons; that has dropped to something between 20,000 and 30,000 tons.

2950. I am asking you whether if you threw your mind back 10 years you think there was the same amount of foreign cheese imported into the country then that there is now?—I could not give you a definite opinion.

2951. What I wanted to try and get information from you upon was this: where the competition comes in with Cheshire cheese when it seems to me that the Cheshire people are having a good time now; they are increasing their output; is not that so; and the farmers are considered to be in a fairly flourishing condition, the cheesemakers?—But to do that you have to consider another item of expenditure. The Cheshire farmer, to increase the output of cheese, probably has spent 200 or 300 per cent. more in feeding stuffs, corn and cake, &c.; so whatever the output is, the expense in producing it, of course, wipes out any extra profit.

2952. In other words, you mean it costs more to produce it?—Yes.

2953. You said something a little while ago about the desire of those you represent, that there should be a sign board put over the shops of those that sell foreign meat. I suppose you mean that to apply to grocers as well as butchers?—Provision dealers, I suppose, it would apply to.

2954. The grocer generally sells cheese, does not he?—Nn, he is not supposed to do so. In country places and small towns, the grocers do it where they have the provisions mixed up with grocery. It is not done in the best trades.

2955. If you go into any town of 60,000 inhabitants, do you find the grocer sells cheese?—The best class of grocers do not. If they did they would have a separate shop for it.

2956. That is contrary to my knowledge and experience of smaller towns?—For instance, we will take Chester, 40,000 inhabitants.

2957. Is not Chester rather a special place; take Hull, for example, a place of a hundred thousand; does it obtain there?—I do not know; I could not speak for Hull; we send a good deal of Cheshire cheese there.

2958. Suppose a grocer does sell cheese or bacon, or hams of foreign production, do you wish to have the sign put over his door?—Yes, there can be no objection to that.

2959. Or in the window, I suppose?—Yes, somewhere where the customers can see it, if he is not ashamed to sell foreign stuff; there is no reason why his customers should be kept in the dark about it.

2960. Do you think there is any grocer in such a state that if registration was adopted as proposed in this Bill, he would not be obliged to be registered; if a grocer sells English hams, for instance, he is bound to sell foreign hams?—Yes.

2961. Everybody knows that if he wants to pay only 6*d.* a pound for his ham, the ham that

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

is supplied to him is foreign ham, do not they?—Yes.

2962. What advantage would there be if every grocer had a sign up; there could be no advantage, could there?—No, but it would prevent any misrepresentation; his customers would know, and he himself would not be injured by the sign being put up.

2963. Is not the real reason why you and your friends support this Bill, that you believe you will get a better price for your cheese if it passes?—Well, we believe we shall have fair-play.

2964. What do you mean by "fair-play;" just tell me what you mean by that?—What I mean is this: we shall prevent the provision merchant substituting a foreign article and selling it as Cheshire.

2965. You have fair-play now if you like to mark your own cheese, have not you?—That would be quite un-English to compel an Englishman to mark his own cheese.

2966. Have you read the evidence of the gentleman who appeared here the other day on behalf of a cheddar cheese company, who told us that they marked their cheese and got a better price for it. The very best cheese they make they mark with their brand?—They do not mark the inferior, I suppose,

2967. What he said was this, and I want you to bear it in mind; he said: We mark our best cheese, and as a consequence of our marking we make a bigger price; and when asked by the Chairman (I think it was) whether they marked the inferior cheese, he said, "Oh dear, no." Now you have perfect freedom to mark your cheese if you wish to do so, have you not?—We do not wish to be compelled to mark our cheese and allow the foreigner to do as he likes.

2968. But the foreigner does as he likes and you do as you like at present; that seems to be "fair-play," does it not?—He can do as he likes in his own country; but when he comes over to this country we expect him to compete on fair lines.

2969. Is there any special cheese made in Scotland?—Yes; we had some exhibits sent down to our Chester show, some five or six years ago.

2970. Would you desire the Scotch people to mark their produce?—No, not at all.

2971. Would you like to compel them to mark it?—No; they are in the British Isles.

2972. They are part of the British Empire?—Yes, certainly.

2973. Would you apply the same principle to Canada?—No.

2974. It is part of the British Empire, is not it?—It is a colony. One hardly looks at Scotland in that light.

2975. We are an empire. It seems we are an empire in everything except when it comes to desiring protection for trade; is not that it?—No. I was just going to remark about that Scotch cheese that we got a little into trouble about it when they exhibited in Chester. The reporter came in to look at these cheeses and he found someone, I think, standing upon them, and he afterwards gave a description of them, and called them "cannon balls," and they wrote a very

scathing

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

scathing article in one of their papers, and promised us they would never come to compete against us any more.

2976. You told us a little while since that a friend of yours told you, or that a friend of yours was told by a friend of his about somebody selling cheese that was Canadian for "British"; have you any actual knowledge of your own of such a thing taking place; I do not mean hearsay information; I want to know if you have any information of you own in regard to it. Have you ever met any of these people?—Yes, I have. I have had it from them point blank that they would have no hesitation if they happen not to have got the "fine Cheshire" by them, in substituting the foreign article, and selling it as "Cheshire"; I have been told that by some of the 25 per cent.

2977. Have you any basis on which to credit this "25 per cent.?"—Only from careful inquiry and observation which might extend over several years.

2978. You think that these people who, you say, would not object to sell foreign cheese for English in this way would be about 25 per cent. of the whole?—As nearly as I can estimate; I am giving it as a rough estimate.

2979. Have you ever tested the thing yourself; have you ever gone into a shop and asked for Cheshire cheese and got anything else given you?—I have not, but I have seen foreign cheese ticketed as Cheshire.

2980. Of course your special experience would indicate it to you?—I have no difficulty at all in detecting the difference.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

2981. You were asked by Mr. Doughty where does the competition come in between the Canadian cheese and the Cheshire cheese; he wanted to know how it was that Canadian cheese prevented Cheshire cheese being a higher price than it is?—It is by the competition.

2982. I do not think you made it quite clear how the competition comes in. I would like to ask you this: What do you think would be the present price of Cheshire cheese if there was no Canadian competition?—I could hardly give an estimate of what the price would be then. The finest of the Cheshire would probably go up to 1*s.* per lb.

2983. Will you tell us how much per lb. you think the whole Cheshire product, taken on the average, would be increased in price if you had no Canadian competition, would it be increased 2*d.* a lb., do you think?—I should think it would. But what I want to make clear is this. The Cheshire farmers, the Cheshire-cheese makers, do not want to interfere with the foreign competition at all. All they want to do is to prevent unprincipled provision merchants selling foreign cheese as Cheshire cheese.

2984. Is it the case, in your opinion, that the competition of the Canadian cheese comes into effect practically with Cheshire cheese to the extent of 2*d.* a lb.: is not that where the competition comes in; that the imported Canadian cheese keeps down the price of Cheshire cheese by 2*d.* a lb.?—I presume if we did not get it from Canada, we should get it from somewhere else.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

2985. I do not want you to presume anything. Is it not the fact that if you had no Canadian competition, the price of Cheshire cheese would be increased by 2*d.* per lb. as compared with what it is, and to that extent Canadian cheese competes?—Yes, probably.

2986. You told us that 60,000 tons of Canadian cheese are imported every year?—I think between 50,000 tons and 60,000 tons was the last figure.

2987. What proportion of the Canadian cheese is adulterated?—I am not prepared to say that there is any adulteration in the Canadian cheese.

2988. Is not some of the cheese that comes from Canada known as filled cheese?—I never heard of a single instance, as regards Canadian cheese. I believe that the Canadian cheese is about the finest we get from abroad.

2989. From America we get a considerable quantity of filled cheese, do we not?—I believe so; but that comes from the United States of America, not from Canada.

2990. What proportion of the cheese coming from the States is filled cheese?—I cannot say.

2991. Are you aware that it is the fact that a good deal of this filled cheese is not detected?—That is quite possible.

2992. Have you read the evidence given before a Committee of this House this year, and the year before, on Food Adulteration?—No.

2993. Do we get any skimmed-milk cheese from Canada?—I do not think so.

2994. We get a considerable quantity of it from the United States, do we not?—We get very much inferior cheese from the States than we do from Canada.

2995. Is it the fact that we get from America a considerable quantity of skimmed-milk cheese?—It is reported so.

2996. At present any man dealing in game is obliged to have a license, is he not?—Yes.

2997. He does not consider that a hardship, does he?—Certainly not.

2998. Where would be the hardship in compelling a man to be registered when he deals in foreign produce; is it not really an advertisement. We have had a good deal of evidence that foreign produce is as good, if not better, than English produce, and if so, the fact of a man having a board outside his shop which would tell the public that he was a registered dealer in foreign produce would act as an advertisement, would it not, and he ought to be glad to have such an advertisement so cheaply?—I do not think it would do him any harm in his business.

2999. Do you not think as an ordinary business man of the world, if it be the fact that this foreign produce is better, as some people allege, than the home-grown produce, it would be a distinct advantage to these men to get such a cheap advertisement as they would have if they were compelled by law to have a notice board outside their shops to say that they were registered dealers in foreign produce?—But I do not give it as my opinion that the foreign produce is superior to British produce.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

3000. Is it not the fact that these gentlemen object to be registered, because they know that foreign produce is not as good as home-grown, is not that really why they object to be registered?—I have no doubt that is their objection.

3001. With regard to a reply you made to a question put by Mr. Doughty, would you not be perfectly satisfied that your own product in Cheshire should be marked "Cheshire cheese," provided that all foreigners were obliged to mark their cheese with the name of the district or country from which it came?—Yes, we should not offer the slightest objection to that.

3002. You would be well satisfied to mark your own cheese as Cheshire if that were so?—Yes.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3003. A suggestion was made in a former question as to marking all English cheese. I do not want to put the question to every witness, but other Members have raised the point, so we are obliged to go into it to a certain extent. A suggestion was made that it would be fair and right to ask English makers to mark their cheese. Has it also suggested itself to you that there might be a danger of the foreigner doing the same, and marking his cheese as English?—Yes, they might do.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

3004. You were also asked in the course of your examination as to whether you had ever bought American cheese, thinking it was English, but of course you know you are not in the same position as myself; I can say I have done so. What is the objection to marking the foreign cheese in the mind of the retailer, do you suppose?—As I said before, 75 per cent. of the retail men, I believe, to-day would favour it, but the other 25 per cent. would object to it. I think, in justice to the 75 per cent. who would always refuse to sell a foreign article as Cheshire, the other 25 per cent. should be coerced.

3005. There would be no wholesale representative opposed to marking the foreign, would there?—I do not think so.

3006. We had a witness at our last sitting who was a wholesale representative, and he was quite in favour of marking the foreign?—I think the wholesale people, at any rate, would be quite indifferent.

Mr. MORGAN HOPKIN, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3007. YOU are a meat salesman and cattle dealer, carrying on business in the Meat Market, Swansea?—Yes.

3008. I believe you have been a member of the county council of Swansea for the past two years?—Yes.

3009. You have for several years represented the traders of South Wales on the executive of the National Federation of Meat Traders?—I have.

3010. You gave evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on this question?—I did.

3011. Is there any alteration you would like to make in the evidence you gave before that Committee?—I really do not know how far that evidence is in accordance with the present inquiry.

3012. Are you of the same opinion as you were when you were examined before the House of Lords Committee?—As regards the question of identification, in the evidence I tendered before the House of Lords Committee, I did not express myself in favour of the marking the meat by means of branding it. I distinctly laid down that in my opinion no practical results would follow from branding the meat, and I thought a better means of identification would be by separating the departments in an establishment and confining the sale of foreign meat, that is, imported frozen meat, to one department apart from the British meat. In my opinion, that was the most feasible plan in the event of legislation taking place upon this matter.

3013. Do you prefer a system of registration of people as dealers in foreign meat, to marking the meat?—I do not think that any benefit would result from that in my part of the country.

Chairman—continued.

3014. You are not in favour of the marking of the meat?—I am not. Perhaps you would allow me to refer to my evidence before the House of Lords Committee.

3015. I take it that you are in favour of the Bill?—I am not in favour of the manner in which this Bill is recited here. I am only in favour of it to this extent: that if imported meat is to be identified from British meat, I think the only manner in which it could be identified, is, by having a separate department in the case of the man who carries on the two businesses.

3016. Do you mean by having the shop registered as a shop for foreign meat, as distinct from a shop for British meat?—No, that is not what I mean; I mean this. If I carry on business in my own particular trade and sell imported frozen meat, in order to carry out any practical results, if any legislation is deemed necessary, in my opinion, the only way to do it is by having a separate department in my shop, and in the one department to have exclusively imported meat, and in the other department, British meat.

3017. That is to say, you would have one counter, say, for British meat, and the other counter for foreign?—Yes.

3018. Then you would not be in favour of marking the meat in any way?—Certainly not.

3019. I forget whether you said before the Committee of the House of Lords that you would be in favour of marking meat?—I do not think I did. The Committee adjourned during my evidence, to see the manner in which the meat

Chairman—continued.

meat would be marked, and when I saw it I was opposed to it.

3020. I think you said then, you were in favour of marking the meat with a label; you say, in answer to Question 2699, "I distinctly state that all meat landed in this country in a frozen condition should be labelled." I take it that you are not now in favour of labelling the meat?—No; because I do not think any good will result from that. You will see what I suggested in answer to Question 2702 was that the meat should be kept distinct and separate from British meat.

3021. You prefer what you suggested in answer to Question 2702, that is to say, that the meat should be kept in distinct departments on each side of the shop, to marking the meat?—Yes.

3022. How are you going to prevent a man from moving a piece of meat from one side to the other?—You could not prevent that, but I take it that if this Bill came into operation you would appoint a special inspector, and if that inspector in passing through a shop, or passing by a shop, observed a joint of frozen meat amongst the British, it would show that the man was intending to commit a fraud, and he would thereby be liable to a penalty for it.

3023. But we have had it given in evidence that when the meat is cut up into small pieces, for instance chops, no inspector would be likely to detect it?—I do not think that is so.

3024. You think that even with a mutton chop you could detect the difference?—I think that any ordinary butcher can tell the difference between frozen meat and British, however small it is cut up.

3025. Could he distinguish between refrigerated meat and British meat?—You mean as between refrigerated beef and British beef.

3026. Or refrigerated mutton?—We do not get refrigerated mutton; the mutton is frozen. The beef is refrigerated when sent from the States and frozen when sent from Australia. I do not think that in the case of refrigerated beef you would be able to identify the meat because it is not quite frozen. There would be a difficulty about that.

3027. It is only frozen if it crosses the equator?—Quite so.

3028. That is to say, coming from New Zealand and Australia?—Yes.

3029. If a man could not tell the difference between refrigerated beef and fresh beef, how would it be any protection in the case of a fraudulent tradesmen who desired to deceive the public to have one counter for British and the other counter for foreign meat if the tradesman could change the pieces from one counter to the other?—I observe the difficulty in that particular case.

3030. You think that would be a difficulty?—I think it would be a difficulty in that particular instance.

3031. Do you take it that the effect of passing this Bill would be to increase the sale of British as against foreign meat?—I do not think so.

3032. Then you do not think it would be any good to the British agriculturist?—I am afraid not; I should like to make a distinct declaration

Chairman—continued.

on that point. I think if the Legislature were to adopt another method it would have a far better effect.

3033. What is the method you would recommend?—I would recommend what I have consistently recommended for years. I generally act in the capacity of a judge at some of our local shows in Wales, and at the ordinaries afterwards in giving expression to my opinion I have always said that I think the only means by which the agriculturists in this country would be able successfully to compete with foreigners would be first and foremost that the Legislature should compel every railway company in England to carry the produce of agriculturists at a lesser rate.

3034. I am afraid we cannot go into that; it is not within the reference of this Committee; we have only to consider the Bill before us; I gather you do not think that the Bill now before us would be any benefit to the agriculturists in this country?—Not to any material extent.

3035. Nor any system of distinguishing foreign from British meat; do you consider that any other system, such as what you have suggested, would benefit British agriculture?—I am afraid not.

3036. Then upon what grounds are you in favour of the Bill?—Only to the extent I have indicated in the event of fraud occurring, or rather I should hardly like to use so strong a word as "fraud." In our part of the country the class of people who carry on the business of selling frozen American beef are such firms as Eastman's and the British and Colonial, as they are called, and they adopt a method which I think ought to be deprecated very much, and that is, to purchase our own local meat and display it for sale amongst their own foreign imported meat; and my impression is, that the people are inclined to be led astray by having one palmed off for the other. I do not for a moment believe that such a thing is done in London amongst the tradesmen in London, but such a thing is likely to be done in the country where I come from in South Wales.

3037. People who would be guilty of deception such as that would be likely to be equally guilty of trying to deceive the public by shifting the meat from one counter to the other if you had two departments in the shop?—That is so.

3038. It would be impossible to brand each piece of meat?—Quite so. The only difference in Wales is that the business of selling imported meat is confined to these particular American people, and is not adopted by the average tradesman.

3039. Has the sale of foreign meat interfered very much with the farmers in your part of the country and their profits?—Yes, that is so; but I can hardly say to what extent it has affected the sale of their produce.

3040. Do people round Swansea buy meat from considerations of the country of its origin at all, or do they simply judge it by its quality and price?—I think cheapness enters a great deal into it. These people hawk this meat at this ridiculously low price and people are tempted to buy it.

3041. The meat that is sold at that low

Chairman—continued.

price is not of a very good quality ?—No, they generally sell inferior River Plate mutton, and inferior Australian meat.

3042. Is there any other point you would wish specially to refer to?—I should like to make reference to the statement of Mr. Cooper with regard to Clause 15. I have taken the opinion of traders in Merthyr, Aberdare, and the Rhondda Valley; they represent a large consuming area, and I have put to them the question with regard to Clause 15, and they have distinctly answered me that they strongly oppose the suggestion made by Mr. Cooper in his evidence, to the effect that if this Bill is passed Clause 15 should certainly not be passed in the manner in which it stands here, but that all cattle landed alive from Canada and the States, if slaughtered in England, should be recognised as foreign meat.

3043. I do not quite follow you. Do you desire that meat landed alive at Deptford and Birkenhead should be classed as British or as foreign?—As British.

3044. You approve of Clause 15?—Most decidedly.

3045. Mr. Cooper objected to Clause 15?—I understood in his evidence he did so; and as I feared his evidence was having some influence with the Committee I thought the sooner that was met with opposition the better. I think Mr. Cooper made special reference to Aberdeen cattle, both Aberdeen beef and Aberdeen mutton, and I am of opinion that if 10 Scotch polled cattle from Canada were put alive in a stall and 10 Scotch polled cattle from Aberdeen were put alive into a stall neither Mr. Cooper nor any man living could tell the difference between them when they were alive. And if he could not do that when they were alive, I am certain he could not do so when they were slaughtered; and as it is absolutely impossible for any practical man to tell these animals apart when slaughtered I think it would be utterly ridiculous to attempt to mark them or identify them as foreign, especially when you consider that after all the cattle so sent over from Canada or the United States are the products of the very best breed in our country.

3046. That is to say you consider they are as much British as the son of British parents born abroad is British?—I do.

3047. Do you speak from experience of the difficulty of distinguishing those cattle from British?—I do; I have sold hundreds of sides of Birkenhead beef. I had a very large contract last year and the year before for between 5,000 and 6,000 soldiers, and I bought the cattle alive at Birkenhead and had them slaughtered. I have had sides of Birkenhead beef alongside our home-killed beef and it is impossible to distinguish the one from the other.

3048. That I think entirely bears out the evidence you gave before the House of Lords' Committee?—Yes.

3049. As I understand, although you were not in favour of describing this meat that is brought over on hoof and is killed in our ports as foreign, you were then in favour of labelling the other meat; now I take it you are not in favour of labelling?—If by labelling you could carry

Chairman—continued.

into effect any practical good I should be; but my opinion from experience is this: that the frozen meat that is sold about the country is generally sold to poor people and cut up into small portions, and if you label it you will have to carry the labelling down to very great detail.

3050. You mean you will have to descend to small pieces and joints?—Quite so. In order to obviate that difficulty I thought it better to separate the two departments if a man engaged in the trade of selling foreign as well as British meat.

3051. Is there any other points which you would wish to bring before the Committee before you are cross-examined?—I do not think there is if I may not follow up what I stated with regard to my suggestion as to the railway rates.

3052. We cannot go outside the Bill?—Then I have nothing more to add.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3053. Let me ask you this in order to define your position exactly. I understand you do not stick to all the evidence you gave before the House of Lords Committee?—I do not know that I can go from that evidence.

3054. It is two years ago, and people, of course, change their minds in two years. Then you said you were in favour of marking, as I understand?—I said, in reply to Question 2702: "I would suggest, as regards all people dealing with this meat, that the meat should be kept distinct and separate from the British meat, that is from home-killed meat."

3055. I will read Question 2701: "There are two proposals before Parliament. I do not know whether you have studied them; one is, that a label should be fixed on each piece of meat in the butcher's shop" (that is number one), "the other is, that the carcases before they are shipped from a foreign country, or colony, should be marked there, so that they could be identified. Have you given this your consideration.—(A). I have not in that sense, and I do not think the one you suggest first is practicable at all." That implies agreeing with the second part, I take it. You do agree with the second part, that it should be marked in the foreign country from which it comes?—I gave the answer that is quoted at No. 2701, in which I said I should not in that sense agree at all.

Chairman.

3056. You do not mean to imply agreement with the second suggestion?—No.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3057. You are not in favour of the carcases being marked in the foreign country, or colony, before they come here?—No, I am not.

3058. Then the only part of the Bill you are in favour of is Clause 15, the Birkenhead compromise as it has been called?—I ought to say that we had a meeting at Coventry at which I was elected to give this evidence, and we approved of the principle of indentification of frozen meat upon the broad principle; this was one of the grounds, for instance: All the meat that is imported

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

imported into this country in a frozen state is meat as to which the labour entailed in preparing it is carried out in a foreign country; and those people do not contribute a single penny towards this country; that is to say, a man sending 10,000 carcases to England gets the money in gold and does not contribute a penny piece in rates to this country, whereas in the case of the man who sends 1,000 cattle to England alive, those cattle entail a certain amount of labour in preparing them for the market. I think upon the broad principle of fair play all round, that a man who sends frozen meat to this country should be asked to identify that frozen meat from the article that comes in here alive; and I thought that the best means to identify that meat was to put it in separate departments.

3059. I think I understand your position. You are not in favour of marking, but you are in favour of its being sold in separate shops or departments, and in some way identifying the frozen meat and the meat which comes in alive? —Quite so. Following up the Chairman's question as to whether I think that will benefit British agriculture, I say I do not think so, and if this Bill is promoted in Parliament upon that standpoint, I think it will fail. If it is promoted from the standpoint of preventing fraud, then there may be some reason in it.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

3060. Why do you approve of Clause 15: is it altogether because you are a Protectionist?—Not at all, it is for this simple reason——

3061. Did not you tell us that the reason you approve of Clause 15 was that the foreign consignor of foreign-killed meat gave no labour in England; is not that the reason?—That is quite right, but I do not think you ought to put it that I am a Protectionist on that ground. I would rather say a political economist.

3062. Very well; I will call it anything you like. You said that taking the United States black-polled cattle and the Canadian black-polled cattle, nobody could distinguish them when they were killed from Aberdeen fell black-polled cattle?—I do.

3063. Do you say that of all the black-polled cattle that come from the States and all the black-polled cattle that come from Canada?—By black polled, we mean Scotch polled or Aberdeen polled. Taking them, I say, that as regards all that is brought from the States and Canada, I do not think that any butcher could tell them alive or dead from the black-polled Aberdeen cattle.

3064. Would you go so far as to say that, as regards the half-bred pollies that come from abroad?—I should not like to say that, as compared with the pure bred polled Angus bullocks.

3065. Do you think it is possible to distinguish between a half-bred pollie, coming from the United States or Canada and a half-bred pollie fed in this country?—I do not think it would be possible. Of course, it all depends where they come from; whether they come from the States or South America. There is a vast difference between the South American cattle and the Canadian cattle. There are half-bred

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

polled cattle as well; they are crossed with the American cattle.

3066. What proportion of the polled cattle, which come from the United States or Canada, would you say were as well finished as the polled cattle fed in Aberdeen?—Probably, the proportion of them is not so great. The reason I made reference to them was because Mr. Cooper dwelt very largely upon the Aberdeen cattle, and said he dealt in nothing but Aberdeen cattle. I believe there is a very small proportion of polled cattle coming from Canada; the majority are cross-bred shorthorns and Herefords.

3067. If the majority of the cattle coming from Canada and the States are not polled cattle but half-bred Shorthorns, do you think they are as good as the English cattle?—Yes, I do; I think they are as good in every respect.

3068. As well finished?—As regards the fat cattle from the States and Canada.

3069. Taking them as a whole, do you think so?—It is a difficult matter to say. Yes, I think I could safely say that, and my reason for saying that is that the people who ship cattle alive from the States and Canada would only ship the best cattle because of the insurance charge.

3070. A large proportion of the cattle coming here alive come from Argentina, do they not?—The quantity is increasing, but it is not as large as from the States and Canada.

3071. Is it 20 per cent.?—I should not like to give an expression of opinion as to the figure.

3072. No matter what the percentage may be for the moment, how would you class them in comparison with English-fed beef?—It is nothing like so good as English.

3073. Would you consider them very inferior? —I would now; but they are improving every year.

3074. But at the present time they are inferior?—They are inferior but not very inferior. They are superior to the common-class cattle produced in England and some parts of Scotland.

3075. When we were at Deptford the other day the Argentina cattle were not to compare with the English cattle?—There are several qualities of Argentina cattle. I have seen some Argentina cattle making as much as 18*l.* and 20*l.* a-piece in Birkenhead.

3076. What proportion of the whole consign ment of the Argentina cattle coming to Birkenhead made that price?—A small proportiou.

3077. Would it be 10 per cent?—I should not like to express an opinion.

3078. Would it be 5 per cent.?—I will tell you the reason why I cannot give you an answer to that question. If you take ten years ago there was hardly a bullock sent from South America here——

3079. I am speaking of this year?—I do not know that I could give an answer to the question.

3080. Is it not the fact that a very large proportion of the cattle that come from Argentina either to Deptford or to Birkenhead are inferior to the English-bred and English-fed cattle?—Yes, I think so.

3081. Nevertheless you are in favour of Clause 15 of the Bill, because you want to elevate those inferior cattle to the class of English cattle?—No, not for that reason.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

3082. Is not that the effect of Clause 15?—Not as I read it.

3083. Would not it have the effect of putting the inferior Argentina cattle when they come to Birkenhead or are slaughtered at Deptford on exactly the same plane and level of value and quality with English-bred cattle?—When you consider——

3084. Is that the effect you want to produce by Clause 15?—I want the effect of Clause 15 to be a just one——

3085. Would that be just?—When you consider the South American graziers come over here and buy the very best of our breeds of cattle and sheep and take them to cross them over there——

3086. I am not considering the South American graziers at all?—But at the same time you ought to consider the South American cattle when they are produced from the best of our own breeds. I am only giving my opinion, as a butcher, and it is this: That in the course of a few years, within the next three years probably, South American cattle will be almost as good as some of the best cattle in England, for the simple reason that the best breeds are going out there year after year and they are improving every season as they come across.

3087. You told us you were in favour of having two counters in the shop, one for the sale of foreign meat and one for the sale of British meat, when the man deals in both?—Yes.

3088. Would you have a notice posted up above the counter, showing the purchaser when he was buying frozen meat and when he was buying English meat?—Quite so.

3089. Can you detect a chop cut from a defrosted foreign sheep from a chop cut from the carcase of an English sheep?—Certainly, any butcher could do it.

3090. Would an ordinary meat inspector be able to do it?—That depends upon what you mean.

3091. For instance, you know that there are five or six meat inspectors in the Central Meat Market; would those gentlemen, dealing with meat every day in the year, be able to tell the difference if they went into a shop?—They ought to be able to.

3092. Are you in favour of men being registered if they deal in foreign meat?—Yes; I see no harm in that at all.

3093. You would be in favour of that?—Yes, certainly.

3094. You told us that last year you had a contract in Wales for 6,000 soldiers?—Yes, at Tenby.

3095. Under that contract do the War Office only permit a certain proportion of the supplies to be of foreign origin?—That is with regard to frozen meat.

3096. With regard to frozen meat only?—Yes.

3097. I am speaking now of meat killed abroad?—All meat killed abroad is frozen or refrigerated.

3098. The meat killed in the United States and Canada is not frozen?—No; it is refrigerated.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

3099. Do you know that the present Under Secretary for War, in the House of Commons, has given an undertaking this year that he will, if possible, relax those conditions and compel the contractors to supply a larger proportion of home grown than they were obliged to do before, on the ground that a pound of home-grown beef is more nutritious to a soldier than a pound of foreign?—I never cut up refrigerated meat for the soldiers, I always cut up Birkenhead meat.

3100. It is better for the contractor?—It is better for the contractor.

3101. It is better for the contractor and the soldiers to?—If I had 10,000 soldiers to cater for in the summer in Aldershot, I would prefer to cut up every piece of that beef from Deptford rather than refrigerated beef.

3102. It is better for the contractor and for the soldier?—It is better for me as a contractor.

3103. And better for the soldier?—I am not in a position to say that, because I believe this: I saw some hind-quarters of refrigerated meat in the market to-day that would compare very favourably with any beef, I believe.

Mr. *Doughty*.

3104. I do not quite understand your position before the Committee, perhaps you will make it clear; are you in favour of the Bill or opposed to it?—To give a direct answer I would say that if the Bill is promoted for the purpose of benefiting the agriculturist I say it is of no avail whatever.

3105. That is no answer to my question. You are not here to consider the interests of the agriculturists; you are here to give an opinion on the Bill; are you in favour of it or opposed to it?—I am in favour of the principle of identifying frozen meat as against British meat.

3106. Then, in other words, what you wish us to do is, you would like frozen meat marked?—No, because I say again it is impossible to mark frozen meat for the purposes contained in this Bill. I am here to give my best opinion as to the means of identifying the foreign meat.

3107. You want it identified. There has been a great deal of evidence given before this Committee with regard to frozen meat. Do you think it is possible for a butcher to tell frozen mutton from English mutton; is he ever deceived?—Certainly not.

3108. Do you think that an ordinary English house-wife going into a butcher's shop and finding there a piece of frozen mutton and a piece of English mutton would have any difficulty in telling the one from the other?—I can only reply to that question by stating this: I observed a shop where a man purported to be selling Welsh mutton, which was nothing but frozen mutton floured over.

3109. Is it the fact that frozen mutton discolours through being frozen?—It does, there is not that bloom upon the lean of the meat.

3110. Is it not the case also that as soon as the air gets to it it begins to turn flabby?—It does.

3111. Do you know that you are the only

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

witness, so far as my memory goes, who has stated here that anyone could tell frozen mutton from English mutton without difficulty?—There is such an enormous amount of ignorance on the part of the average house-wife that they are led astray in that way.

3112. Do you think that frozen mutton is not to be distinguished from English mutton by an ordinary person unless he was an expert?—I think that a person who is sufficiently educated in that way ought to be able to do so. I certainly could tell the difference in a moment.

3113. If you are desirous that the public should not be deceived as to the article which they are buying, why do not they want the same principle applied to foreign beef killed in England?—Because it cannot possibly be done.

3114. If you are to have a separate department in the shop, one for foreign meat and one for English meat, there can be no difficulty, can there?—Certainly.

3115. What difficulty?—I kill, say, six Canada heifers and I kill six Welsh heifers, and they are hung up in a stall side by side; or if you like to carry into effect the idea of having them separated when they are hung up, no one can tell the one from the other.

3116. That is the same proposition as you were putting in regard to frozen mutton; you say that they cannot tell one from the other?—They cannot tell one from the other.

3117. Then why do you want a separate department?—For the protection of the public. It is the public I mean as regards the frozen meat, but I say that no butcher could tell the difference between a Canada heifer killed in England and an English heifer killed in England.

3118. I am speaking about the consumer, not about the butcher?—I say the reason why I think Clause 15 could never be practically worked if it distinguished between a Canadian heifer killed in England and an English heifer killed in England is because the butcher could not tell the difference when they are hung up together.

3119. It is not the butcher that I am asking about, but the consumer who is deceived?—Quite so.

3120. Your great anxiety, as I understand your evidence, for proposing to have two separate shops, or departments, one in which to sell foreign meat and one in which to sell English meat, is that the public may not be deceived?—Quite so.

3121. Then I will ask the question again: Why do you object to foreign-grown meat killed at Birkenhead or in London being marked as foreign and sold as such?—You mean foreign beef that is killed at Deptford being marked as foreign?

3122. Yes?—For the simple reason that when you hang it up in any shop, or in any department in the shop, you cannot tell it from English; supposing I hang up a hind quarter of English beef in one department, and a hind quarter of Canadian beef in the other department, who can tell which is which?

3123. Does not the same argument apply to frozen mutton?—With regard to frozen mutton, a person could see it at a glance.

3124. Is not the real reason that you, as a butcher, would go to Birkenhead and buy a lot of this foreign beef yourself and go and sell it for home-grown beef?—Oh, dear no; the bulk of our meat is bought locally, and from Ireland.

3125. You told us a little while ago you went to Birkenhead, and that in your shop you had a side of Birkenhead beef, and a side of Scotch beef, and you could not tell the difference?—At certain seasons of the year, when things are scarce in our part of the country, we have to go there, and also when we have to carry out certain soldiers' contracts to supply soldiers in camp we have to go to Birkenhead.

3126. The point I want clearing up is this. What is your reason for desiring Clause 15 to remain a portion of the Bill. Why do you object to foreign meat grown in Canada being marked as foreign?—For the same reason as I have told you before, because it is utterly impossible to identify it from English if it is killed in this country; that is the only reply I can give.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3127. You do not kill your Welsh heifers and Canadian heifers together; you buy the Canadian heifers killed at Birkenhead?—Yes, or Deptford or Avonmouth.

3128. Why is it not possible to mark them there and then the carcases would carry the marks when you purchased them; they would be marked as foreign meat at Deptford or Birkenhead?—The butcher would cut it off.

3129. Supposing it is marked on the side; not labelled, but branded?—To what extent would you brand it; would you brand it right down the whole length of the side?

3130. It has been proposed to do that?—Then you destroy the value of the whole of the beef.

Chairman.

3131. Branding lets out the juices, does it not?—You would destroy the value by branding. We sell beef by the sight of it, a person buys a piece of meat by the look of it, as we say. If you draw a brand across the side you destroy the value of it altogether.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3132. I am not satisfied as to your explanation of why it is impossible to mark foreign meat, as apparently the Honourable Member who last examined you was not satisfied?—I think I have made myself clear; I am not in favour of marking the meat as a means of identifying it.

Mr. *Doughty.*

3133. You are in favour of it, are you not, as regards frozen mutton?—Not of marking it.

3134. Only of selling it in a separate shop or department?—That is all.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3135. Are you in favour of labelling it?—I do not agree with the proposal to label it, because I do not think it is practicable at all.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

3136. Have you altered your views on that point since you gave evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords, in your evidence, in reply to Question 2711, you said, "What I maintain is that that meat should be labelled as foreign meat, because I take it that when a man goes into that place he ought to have what he pays for"?—After that question was put to me, the Committee adjourned to see the manner in which this meat was to be labelled and marked, and when we saw it I was distinctly opposed to the method adopted for the purpose of marking the meat, for the reason I state, that it simply destroys the value of it from a commercial standpoint.

3137. Did you state that further on anywhere in your evidence?—I stated this: I was asked at Question 2701 whether I had considered the proposal that a label should be fixed on each piece of meat in the butcher's shop, and that the carcases should be marked before they are shipped from abroad, and I said, "I have not in that sense; and I do not think the one you suggest first is practicable at all." Then I was asked, "That is labelled in the shop?" and I answer, "Labelled in the shop, each piece of meat. I would suggest, as regards all people dealing with this meat, that the meat should be kept distinct and separate from the British meat; that is from home-killed meat."

3138. Why should the butcher destroy the branded stamp off the carcase of his heifer any more than your grocer destroys the mark off the side of the pig?—For this reason, that when the pig is cured the rind is a firm material, and the general method is that the cook removes the rind when it is cooked, whereas in the case of meat, to mark it in the fashion proposed would undoubtedly spoil the value of it.

3139. By lettingout the juice?—Not only that, but from the point of view of its being an eyesore; it would be an eyesore to have a side of beef branded down in that fashion.

3140. Does not one see the carcases of sheep up in London shops occasionally with a little sort of diamond mark upon them, cut out of the skin; you see them sometimes prepared for Christmas displays in that fashion?—You mean cut out with a knife?

3141. Yes; that does not spoil the sale, does it?—No; but there is a great difference between doing it with a knife like that and taking the brand all down the side of the beef.

3142. Would there be so much difference between that and a stamp?—If you stamp a side of bacon it does not have any material effect upon the bacon, it does not even penetrate the rind upon the bacon; whereas if you brand beef you destroy the beef. I should certainly oppose the idea of branding frozen meat or home-killed Canadian beef.

Chairman.

3143. Branding would let the juices out, would it not?—It would.

3144. You do not agree with Mr. Cooper that you could tell the best Scotch from the best Birkenhead killed beef?—Certainly not, you could not tell.

3145. Do you have any difficulty with regard to tuberculosis?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

3146. Do you find that foreign cattle are freer or more infected?—We find they are freer; I regret very much to say that; I am very much afraid that that inquiry (and I hope you will not proceed with that question) will very much interfere with us in our trade, because when you come to consider the large number of our own cattle, especially our own shorthorns, who suffer from tuberculosis to a very important extent, and that foreign cattle are so free from it, I am very much afraid that an inquiry of this description will show up to the benefit of the foreigner. I paid as much as 74 guineas for two shorthorns two years ago, and tuberculosis showed itself in a slight degree in one of them; they were two beautiful prize animals. I find among our shorthorn breed tuberculosis predominates very much.

3147. If that is so, anything distinguishing foreign from British meat might possibly be very much to the disadvantage of the British meat producer?—As regards Birkenhead killed beef, no doubt it would.

3148. It would send up the sale of Birkenhead killed beef?—I do not know if it would send it up, but if it became known that Canadian cattle and States cattle were almost free from tuberculosis, whereas our own home-bred cattle were subject to it, I am afraid the public would be inclined to be biased in favour of the Birkenhead beef.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3149. In answer to Mr. Doughty, when he asked you as regards marking the beasts, you said it would be no use; and when he asked you why, you said because the butcher would cut out the mark; would many butchers do that, do you think?—I am afraid butchers are not all saints.

3150. It is not proposed that the marking should be all done by branding, it could be done in some other way. By cutting out the mark you would lose a certain amount of juice; but is not the danger rather that you would destroy the value, not by letting out the juice, but by letting out its foreign origin; perhaps, however, you would not like to answer that question?—No.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

3151. I think you told us you do not often go to Birkenhead to buy cattle?—I do in the season, which begins in April, when we cannot get much cattle from Ireland or from our own country.

3152. I understand that it is only when beef is rather scarce in South Wales, or when the beef coming over to Swansea or Cardiff is scarce that you go to Birkenhead?—Yes.

3153. As long as you can get a sufficient supply for your purposes of South Wales beef or Irish you do not go to Birkenhead?—We do not.

3154. Why is that?—For this reason: first of all, we like to handle our own cattle ourselves in the way of slaughtering them, whereas in Birkenhead we have to buy them in sides; then, when they are conveyed by train, they possibly get a little bit knocked about, and we suffer in that sense. We prefer, as a matter of fact, looking after our own stuff, and buying at our own fairs and markets, as we do in Ireland. We have

good

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

good fairs in Ireland, Waterford, Limerick, and Tipperary, and we prefer going there and to our own fairs in Wales to going to Birkenhead.

3155. Is it because the beef is better?—Not at all.

3156. Is it because you make more profit out of it?—I believe I can buy cattle to better advantage in Ireland to make a profit than I can buy in Birkenhead.

3157. You told us that foreign cattle killed at Deptford or Birkenhead were freer from tuberculosis than English cattle?—Yes.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

3158. Are you aware that the President of the Board of Agriculture last year brought a Bill into the House of Commons, and passed it through both Houses, which prohibited the United States cattle or the Canadian cattle from being taken up country to be fed, on the ground that in so doing it would be dangerous to the health of British cattle?—I believe he urged that as a reason, but I do not agree with him.

3159. He was wrong, you think?—Undoubtedly he was wrong.

3160. You think that the Government were wrong also in passing the Bill?—Quite so.

COLONEL COTTON-JODRELL IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JOHN FRANCIS TEE, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3161. YOU are Managing Director of Pearks, Gunston, and Tee, Limited?—Yes.

3162. You have got several retail provision shops in London?—Yes.

3163. You have been a member of the Bermondsey Vestry for the past eight years, a member of the Bermondsey Board of Overseers, and a member of the Council of the Metropolitan Grocers and Provision Dealers' Association, and you have had 23 years' experience in the retail trade?—Yes.

3164. When you say the retail trade, would that be groceries?—Provisions almost entirely, very little groceries.

3165. Hams, bacon, and cheese?—Hams, bacon, and cheese.

3166. Such things as come under this Bill?—Yes.

3167. You have read the Bill?—Yes.

3168. Will you tell us your general opinion on the question of marking, as to the practicability or the advantages of it. You know that it is proposed to mark "the carcases or sides, or hams of the animals, or in the case of cheese, on the rind of the same"?—I am in this position: I am not in favour of the Bill, neither am I against it. The fact of marking sides of bacon, to my mind, will practically have no effect at all, so far as the consumer is concerned. Bacon is cut up in small pieces after it is branded, as it were, and, consequently, the consumer knows nothing at all about it. With regard to the retailer, he knows what he is buying, as a rule; the only people that I can conceive who might not know might be the very small shopkeepers; but any ordinary person in the trade knows the difference, as regards what he is buying, both with regard to hams and with regard to bacon.

3169. Do you consider that neither in price, nor in the sale as affecting your own trade, would the public be affected?—No. It is a very strange thing, but it has happened just these last two weeks, that Danish bacon has overstepped Irish with regard to price.

3170. It fetches a higher price?—It fetches a higher price.

3171. In the wholesale market?—Yes; that

Chairman—continued.

is to say, No. 1, lean, sizeable, fetches the same price; and No. 2, prime, fetches more for Danish than it does for Irish. I have the printed reports of the prices here, if you like to see them.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3172. It does not fetch more than the best Wiltshire, I presume?—No; not more than the best Wiltshire. There is very little best Wiltshire sold in London, I think.

Chairman.

3173. You consider there has been no systematic fraud in the trade with respect to the sale of foreign or colonial bacon?—No systematic fraud at all, and very little fraud in any way. I have got some of the tickets which are generally used in the way of ticketing up the bacon. It is not used with any name; it is simply ticketed "Very Prime," "Very Choice," "Very Mild," &c.

3174. What bacon do you chiefly dispose of yourself; what do you mostly trade in?—I should think about 50 per cent. would be Danish, about 25 per cent. Irish, and 25 per cent. Canadian, or when I say 25 per cent. you may take off 2 or 3 per cent. for Wiltshire.

3175. In the course of your knowledge of the trade are you acquainted with such phrases as "Wiltshire cut" and "Yorkshire cut"?—Yes, we hear of them, but we take little or no notice of them with regard to the cut.

3176. You do not think much of them?—No, and certainly the public never think or know anything about it.

3177. The public do not come and say to you, "I want so much Wiltshire cut"?—No, we never hear such a thing. The public, as a rule, will come and pick out the bacon. In London we do it differently from Liverpool and other places; we make a large display of cut bacon in the window, and in the front there are a lot of pieces and perhaps a cwt. of rashers all cut up into small rashers, and a lady comes along and picks up what rashers she wants and takes them into the shop and pays for them.

3178. Does not she ask whether it is Denny's, Matterson's, or Philpott's?—No, I never recollect having been asked for any other brand except

Chairman—continued.

Denny's once in a way. Somebody has got to hear that Denny's is a very fine brand of bacon, and they have asked for it.

3179. You are speaking of your customers generally?—Yes.

3180. Where is the place of business in which you generally establish yourself?—I do not go to any of the places of business now; I merely superintend the lot. We have about 40 shops.

3181. Do the remarks you have been making apply to the whole of the 40?—Pretty much so. I may say I have gone up through the whole thing and done it all myself, so that it is from practical experience that I am speaking.

3182. We have had evidonce to-day from a gentleman who did not seem to be a very keen supporter of the Bill, but at all events he told us that he would have no objection to having the sides of bacon and hams branded. What are your views with regard to that?—As I observed, in the first place, I have no objection to its being done. You could not do any possible harm by branding that I know of; at the same time I do not think it is necessary. I think if they were to enforce the Merchandise Marks Act perhaps a bit more, everything in that way would be met.

3183. Do I rightly gather from your proof that there are five brands of English bacon well known in the trade?—No, but I have named three; "Royal Wilts" is one brand, "Harris" is another, and "Boyer and Philpott, Troubridge" the third brand. In some of these cases it is branded in two places: on the back, on the gammon, and on the fore hand, and upon the streak.

3184. But you said you did not sell much English bacon?—Very little English bacon.

3185. What is the difference in price between the three descriptions you sell most of; you told us you sold Danish to the extent of about 50 per cent., Irish 25 per cent., and nearly all the remainder Canadian; would you give us the difference in price?—Yes; the difference between Danish and Irish would be that the Danish would be 3*s.* per cwt. dearer than the Irish on the No. 2; that is bacon that is slightly fatter; that is just over a farthing a lb. With pea-fed, that is Canadian, the difference would be over 1*d.* a lb.

3186. You mean less than the Irish bacon?—Less than the Irish or the Danish.

3187. We have had evidence here to-day that the difference in price between Wiltshire and Canadian bacon amounts to as much as 4*d.* or 5*d.* a lb.; do you agree with that?—No. I spoke to Mr. Kellett afterwards, and he was rather taking the price of the very lowest class American as compared with the best price Wiltshire; he had taken the lowest price of one and the highest price of the other. You see the prices as regards either the English or Irish fluctuate when you get below the best brands. If you get the secondary article it is not worth a great deal, and there is more secondary Irish in the market than there is secondary Danish.

3188. I understand from your proof that you object to the proposal to register the names and addresses of dealers in foreign meat; why do you object to that?—The reason why I object to that is that it would lead the public to think that only foreign provisions were sold there; that is one view of it. There is the other side, that the public might get at one of these shops a piece of English or Irish bacon (and when I speak of English I practically speak of Irish), which was very good, and they would say, "Oh, this is very nice," and they would conclude it was foreign bacon, from the fact of seeing that advertisement put up there.

3189. You mean, because the man put up the notice that he dealt in foreign meat?—Yes.

3189. *We have had in this room this afternoon two instances of Members of the Committee selecting American hams for Irish and *vice versâ*?—Yes, I am afraid they did not know much about it.

3190. Do you suppose that the public know any more?—The public do not know so much undoubtedly, and, as I say, I have not the least objection to bacon and hams being branded; but the trader should know what he is buying.

3191. Why the trader only; why should not the consumer know also?—If the consumer asks, no doubt the trader will tell him. In most respectable shops they will certainly tell the consumer anything in an ordinary way that they are asked with regard to business. It would not be to the advantage of a shopkeeper who wanted to keep a trade, and make a trade for himself, to sell an American ham in place of an Irish one. I daresay you saw from the hams which were produced in this room that the American ham was soft and oily looking. Again you can distinguish it by the way it was cut, but I was speaking just then as to its quality. Anyone could turn round and say directly, "I do not like the look of that ham."

3192. Some of us would not be able to tell it until it was taken home and boiled?—It would not be to the advantage of a shopkeeper if his customers took it home and boiled it, and then did not like it; they would not be likely to come to the shop again.

3193. You mention that the price of Danish bacon is higher than the price of Irish?—Yes.

3194. With regard to this proposal to mark, do you think that the mark would call attention to the foreign beef and foreign bacon and cheese, and so forth; would it serve to advertise them rather?—Are you speaking of marking the article itself?

3195. I am speaking of marking the carcase?—I do not think it would make any difference in that respect; as I said before, the public do not look at the mark upon the side; they only have the small pieces.

3196. You do not think the public care so long as it is good?—They would not know because they would not see it; they would see it now and again if they saw a stack of sides as they do now with the different brands, but where the best Irish or anything of that sort is sold, you do not hang up the sides so as to show the brand; you merely show the bacon in the ordinary way where you are selling the best; you do not make an advertisement of it.

3197. Some of the butchers selling foreign meat

Chairman—continued.

meat seem to have a desire to advertise it, because in the City yesterday I saw a quantity of the smaller butcher shops where they were advertising in large letters "New Zealand lamb," or "Prime Australian beef": they do not mind advertising it at all, apparently?—No.

3198. They seem to have an objection to being forced to put it up?—They do not like a notice over the shop, I think, because the inference would be that they sold foreign meat and only foreign meat; that is what some people would think.

3199. Now with regard to cheese, do you do much in the cheese trade?—Yes, we do a very large American cheese trade, it is principally American cheese.

3200. Entering into competition with what English cheese?—It enters into competition with no English cheese at all; the whole of our cheese trade is done in this way—the cheese is cut up (it is Canadian cheese) into a number of pieces, you will find some hundreds of pieces all cut up, and a person comes and tastes a piece and says, "Yes, I will take that," and it is put on the scale and weighed.

3201. You cut it up?—Yes, we cut it up and the people come and pick it up; if we have put in English cheese at times through the American being dearer or anything of that sort, we invariably have it brought back; I am speaking of London only, you will understand; the public taste here seems to have been educated up to American cheese, and they like it.

3202. What sort of English cheese do you put on under these circumstances?—Of course, occasionally (not just lately), when English cheese goes very cheap, we try to put a piece in in place of American, but we cannot do it.

3203. What kind would it be?—The cheapest, not the very finest.

3204. Made where?—Cheddar. Of course the same remark that I made before applies to the branding of cheese. I have not the slightest objection to branding cheese, but I do not think it is necessary.

3205. You say in your proof that you can produce a handbill used by your firm in advertising Canadian cheddar cheese?—Yes, unfortunately I have not got it with me, but it would show how our company advertise Canadian cheddar cheese. We put on the two words "Canadian cheddar" I have also some of the tickets usually applied to cheese: "Very choice," "Very mild" and so on.

3206. Do you put the name "Canadian" on them?—No, it is only "Very mild" and that sort of thing.

Mr. *Doughty.*

3207. You told us, a few minutes ago, that Danish bacon is making more than Irish with you, just now. Is there any particular reason for that?—Yes, I think the Danes have so improved upon their quality that they have gone past the Irish.

3208. I suppose the same fact obtains with Danish butter?—It is the same thing with Danish butter.

3209. You believe that the Danes have so improved the cultivation of their lands and their

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

cattle and given greater care to their pigs, and so on?—That is so, they have also had a lot of English pigs over to improve the breed and improve the stock over there.

3210. Owing to their greater care and industry they are producing an article which is making a better price than the English?—That is so; the same thing applies to Danish butter; the Danish are a very go-ahead sort of people, there is no doubt about that.

3211. They can compete, then, against our article in the market on its quality?—Yes, on its quality, because they are really at a disadvantage when it comes to be foreign meat. It is on its quality they compete.

3212. You buy the article on its quality?—Yes.

3213. It is not a consideration to you where it comes from?—No, before we go upon a fresh brand or anything of that sort we have a box or bale or so many sides as a sample, and we cook some for our own satisfaction to see it is all right before we allow it to go out to our shops to be sold.

3214. I understood you to say that most bacon was branded?—I do not know about most—there is a lot branded and a lot not branded.

3215. Is the worst or the best branded?—The best.

3216. In buying bacon you are governed to some extent by the brand, I suppose?—Yes, if we know a manufacturer or a factor we naturally, when he advertises his brand and we know it is all right, give preference to it, and that enables him to get a better price.

3217. In other words, his brand is accepted for the article?—It becomes known.

3218. Do you think that if branding obtained generally it would have the same influence on the price of foreign produce?—If branding obtained generally, I do not think it would make much difference.

3219. Are you ever asked in your shops for English bacon?—Never; the customers simply come to the window and look at what you have got, and if it takes their eye they look at it and say, "Is this all right," and the shopman says, "Yes," and they have the piece weighed.

3220. Your customers do not care where it is grown so long as it is good?—Yes, they rely upon your getting something good for them, and they know if you do not you will lose their custom.

3221. It is purely the price and quality that governs the market?—Yes.

3222. With respect to cheese, you have no objection, have you, to cheese being branded?—Not the least objection to its being branded. I do not think it necessary, but I do not see any objection.

3223. If it were branded you think the public would have no better guarantee as to the place of origin?—It would make no difference.

3224. Not if it is cut up as you cut it up?—I do not think it will make any difference to the public.

3225. May we take it from your evidence that so far as you are concerned, as a large buyer, you do not care whether the Bill passes or not?—I do not.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

3226. You do not fear it will do you any harm?—No, the proposal to put up a notice board over the door is not in the Bill, I think; that I should object to.

3227. Even if that were put into the Bill, and you were allowed to put "British and Foreign Provision Merchant," you would have no objection?—That would meet it, I think; there would be no difficulty then.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3228. With regard to your last statement I understand you would object to putting a notice over the door, but you say the objection would be removed if you could put the word "British" as well?—I think so; I do not think there would be much in that.

3229. That is a great step; that is to say you would not mind putting up "Dealer in foreign produce" if you could put up "English" as well?—You would simply say, "English and Foreign Provision Merchants."

3230. I think Mr. Doughty asked you whether some people branded their things in England, and got a better price by doing so?—Yes.

3231. When we get this American bacon which is described under the brand of "Wiltshire cut," or "Yorkshire cut," or "Staffordshire cut," would it be possible in any way that one of the reasons (perhaps a very small one), why they give it that brand or cut is to get a better price for it?—I do not think it is so in London.

3232. Would they do it to get a worse price?—I do not think it affects us in any way,

3233. Do you suggest they go to all that expense and trouble for nothing?—I am speaking of London; it may be so perhaps in the country; that I do not know. With us, for instance, the public come and they do not buy a side or buy a half-side; I do not suppose one customer in a thousand does; they only buy a piece of the side.

3234. Could you suggest why they get this American bacon called under these names and these brands?—Only to distinguish to retailers what it is, because some retailers may want a particular shaped shoulder for cutting or he may want a square shoulder; but so far as the public go they know nothing of it because the thing is cut up. Supposing, for instance, we get a square shoulder, we cut the hock out, and the other part is cut up in rashers.

3235. You saw the placard Mr. Kellett brought in?—Yes.

3236. Do you mean to say that the general public, that is to say by far the largest class of consumers, would understand exactly what that placard meant?—The consumer would know nothing at all about that placard.

3237. Do not you think that he might be rather apt to run away with a wrong idea that this article which was called "Yorkshire cut," "Wiltshire cut," or "Staffordshire cut" was really what it purported to be and was not American?—No, because the customer does not buy the whole thing; he would not know anything of it. The customers buy small pieces.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

3238. They do not all buy small pieces of bacon or slices of ham. For instance, I do not buy a slice of ham, but a ham. I am speaking of a customer who might be going by that shop where that placard which you saw might be stuck up in the window. If he saw this placard stuck up would he not be likely to be misled into the idea that it was not foreign bacon, but that it was Wiltshire or Yorkshire bacon?—I can only say that that is a very hypothetical question. I have during the whole course of my experience, never seen a bill like that or anything of the sort put in the window of a provision shop. I should think everybody would laugh at it.

3239. What was that bill printed for at all?—That is for the benefit of the retail trader as I before observed; it is to give the retail trader an idea of what the cut is, because they cut these different parts and send one part to one place where it suits them; perhaps they may want a lot of rashers in one place and joints in another; they send that which would be suitable to the north of England to the north of England, and the parts suitable to London they send to London; so far as the customer is concerned the customer knows nothing about it and never wants to.

3240. We have your evidence that according to your opinion there is very little fraud; apparently the Bacon Curers Association did not think so, or they would not go to the expense of paying inspectors to go round?—They have established how difficult it is to distinguish between hams even by professionals.

3241. That is not an answer to my question: my question is, would they have gone to the expense of paying inspectors to go round if they thought there was little or no fraud?—If you wish me to answer that question I will answer it, and in doing so I should like to observe that there are often bodies of men calling themselves associations who have gone on these lines before they have been shown up by the magistrates. When you ask why they have gone to this expense, I would say they may have other motives.

3242. Can you suggest what those motives are?—I can tell you a similar thing that happened——

3243. Please answer my question: can you suggest what the other motives are?—Yes, I should say their motives would be to try and improve their own trade, undoubtedly, in some way or other.

3246. How would they improve their trade by doing that; by stopping the foreign from being sold as English, I suppose?—By endeavouring to prove that foreign was sold as English.

3245. And we know they have succeeded?—In some cases they have; in some cases they have not succeeded, though the inspectors swore that foreign meat was being sold.

3246. Inspectors make mistakes sometimes, like other people?—That is very true, and associations make mistakes.

3247. The fact of their failing in one or two places can, of course, be set against their succeeding; but their successes prove that there are instances of this kind of thing going on?—There

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

was a case under the Margarine Act some little time ago as regards a pure butter association— —

3248. That is not the Bacon Curers' Association?—I am not sure whether it was or not.

3249. The Bacon Curers' Association had nothing to do with it.—But there was a society who went about prosecuting people like that until they were found out.

3250. What do you mean by "found out?—In that case they got penalties imposed upon them; they were engaged by some other big provision —

3251. The case you refer to is that of another society, which, as I understand, was guilty of blackmailing?—Yes.

3252. You do not mean to say that you are going to make an accusation against the Bacon Curers' Association that they are blackmailing?—I do not, because I do not know the society. You ask me what the motive was; it is not for me to assume motives.

Chairman.

3253. Is it not a well-known association?—I do not know what bacon curers' association it is.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3254. Is it not an association of the bacon curers of England?—If it is the Association of Bacon Curers of England I should say decidedly their motives would be honourable.

3255. I observed that most of you retailers do not love the British Bacon Curers' Association?—I do not know why we should have any cause to do otherwise; I have no feeling against the British Bacon Curers' Association.

3256. With regard to having the word "foreign" over the shop, you object to putting that up. You said you did not object if there was the word "British" as well; but you objected to putting up the word "foreign," because you thought it might lead the public to think that only foreign provisions were sold there; would that be against trade?—Undoubtedly.

3257. You think that would be done away with if you put up "British and foreign"?—Yes, I think that would be fair all round.

3258. That would entirely take away that objection?—I think so.

Chairman.

3259. Do you know anything about these prosecutions for fraud that were mentioned; do you know the Sumner case that was mentioned?—Hardly sufficiently to give you an authoritative opinion.

3260. Do you know what the result was?—I do not know sufficient of the case to give you any information that would be of any value to you.

Mr. *Doughty.*

3261. Do you know anything about the British Bacon Curers' Association?—No, I never heard about them until within the last two or three weeks. Might I say that my idea was that it was the duty of the officers under the Merchandise Marks Act to have carried out the Act much better than they have done, and if they had I think it would have prevented the necessity for anything further.

3262. Mr. Digby suggested that you provision merchants did not love the British Bacon Curers' Association; perhaps the British Bacon Curers' Association do not love you; you do not buy their goods, perhaps?—We cannot buy a lot of English bacon in London, because it is not suitable for the trade; we want lean bacon. The Danish seem to rear their pigs and feed their pigs to suit the requirements of the London market.

3263. You have given London foreign bacon, and so you have educated the taste of Londoners to it?—There is a lot in that, no doubt; but in the first place Danish bacon was very cheap.

3264. And the foreigners have tried to meet the taste of Londoners?—They have gone past the Irish now.

Chairman.

3265. They first established their trade, and then they are improving their goods?—There is no doubt they are improving wonderfully every year, and I think the time will come when some of the American bacon will run the English and Irish very close. They are making rapid strides; they seem to study the thing so thoroughly that every little thing that can be effective for the benefit of it is done, and you get the stuff on the market a picture, as it were.

Tuesday, 27th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brigg.	Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.	Mr. MacAleese.
Sir William Houldsworth.	Mr. A. H. Smith.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ISAAC STEPHENSON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3266. Do you represent the Leeds Butchers' Association?—Yes.

3267. Of which you are the president?—Yes.

3268. What view does your Association take of the Bill before the Committee?—We think that this Bill is not required; we do not think it is a workable Bill. As for Leeds, we have a very small percentage of frozen or chilled meat sold there; and what is sold is sold by people who advertise it as such. We have one company, the British and Colonial, and another company calling themselves the Home and Colonial, while there is another firm who have pictures in their shop windows showing the Yankee bullock tossing John Bull high up in the air. There are a few who sell frozen mutton in low parts of the city, at prices varying from 2*d.* to 4*d.* per lb. If English meat were sold in the same shops it would fetch no more, as the people who buy that meat want plenty for their money, and are not very particular about the quality. We think it would be almost impossible to ticket all the meat, as I believe this Bill would require us to do.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3269. Do you mean the small pieces?—Yes.

Chairman.

3270. The Bill requires that all foreign meats should be marked on the carcases, or sides or hams of the animals; it is not required that small pieces should be marked?—If that was the case it would be no advantage; because a practical butcher would not mistake between the imported meat and our own. I never heard of any one in Leeds doing such a thing as to buy frozen meat for English meat, there is such a difference in the appearance, and the chilled meat is always labelled and is in white sheets when it comes to the wholesale market. It would simply be for the protection of the retail butcher if it was only the quarters that were marked, because when it was cut in pieces the public would not know that it had been marked unless every bit of it was marked. We contend that there is very little of this foreign meat sold as English; or, if so, the prices would be very much nearer together. It would raise the price of the frozen meat if it were sold as English, as there would be more demand for it. If it is the fact that there are certain people selling this meat as English, I believe the authorities have power to prosecute them under the Merchandise Marks Act, and it would be better to prosecute those individuals if there are such (but we do not think there are any in Leeds) than that every trader should be harassed by a Bill of this description. It would be very awkward, especially this sort of weather, and it would be impossible for any inspector to tell the difference between a quarter of beef, which we have sometimes left in a freezing chamber for a whole week, and frozen meat. The appearance of that meat would very much represent the appearance of the chilled meat that comes from America. I do not know whether this Bill has anything to do with American beasts killed in this country or not.

Chairman—continued.

3271. They are exempt at present under the Bill; but the Committee would like to hear your views upon the point?—I believe there are very few butchers in Leeds who do not sell more or less of that class of meat.

3272. Is that the meat which they get from Birkenhead?—Yes, at certain times of the year; for instance, from now up to Christmas it is almost impossible to get the necessary quantity of first-class meat in our open markets. We cannot go into any of our open markets and see 700 or 800 well-fed cattle, the same as we can see stood together at places like Birkenhead or Deptford. From now up to Christmas the American beef killed at Birkenhead would have the preference with the majority of butchers over the Irish beef.

3273. And over Scotch?—No, not over Scotch. But a good deal of the English beef does not come up to the States beef; that is to say, the second-class English beef does not come up to the States beef; it is only the first-class English beef which does. The Irish beef is not so much appreciated in Leeds as the States beef, on account of the bruised condition in which it arrives. The beasts are very much knocked about in transit, and the meat is very liable to be dark in the lean, which has a tendency to make

the

Chairman—continued.

the meat dry and hard. The American cattle have a deal more care taken of them in transit. The Irish cattle are pushed on to the vessels all together, loose; but every American bullock is fastened up and has so much space, and most of the American cattle at present are dehorned, and I believe in time there will not be such a thing as a bullock coming from America with horns on. That keeps them from fighting and knocking one another about. The quality of the American cattle has improved enormously during the last 10 years, and the quality of South American during the last four years has also improved. It is the general opinion that within a very few years South American meat will be very nearly on a par with our own, as they are buying all our best-bred cattle and thus improving their breeds, whereas our own cattle has not improved to the same degree. The fact is that there is not so good a class of cattle shown in the market to-day as there was 20 years ago. It is very hard to find what we call first-class English bullocks in our open markets. If the Birkenhead or States meat was included in this Bill it would be impossible to prove that it was foreign meat, as there does not seem to be any difference in a great many of their beasts.

3274. Would it be possible to prove a difference between the Argentine cattle and English cattle?—They are getting more nearly like ours now. In former times we could tell very often, but not at all times, and now they are improving them wonderfully. The fat of the meat used to be of a very fiery colour, but now it is improved; the cattle are being brought over younger, and the meat is very much like our meat. It is of a red colour, but they are improving it. Then we think it would be hard lines for an inspector to be allowed to come into our shops and seize a piece of meat on suspicion and take it away and keep it for a day, as would most likely be the case. During this weather the meat might possibly be worth nothing when it was brought back to the butcher. That is one thing we have a very strong objection to.

3275. Are you referring to Clause 9 of the Bill?—Yes.

3276. Under this Bill, Birkenhead and Deptford meat is not included, but is allowed to be described as British. In the event of a Bill for meat marking being passed, although you object to meat marking altogether, would you be in favour of excluding Birkenhead and Deptford meat from being marked?—That is if a Bill had to be passed at all; but we do not want a Bill in any shape or form.

3277. Do you object altogether to marking?—Yes.

3278. Have you considered one suggestion which has been made, that the dead meat which comes over to this country should be marked with its place of origin, and that the Custom House officers should see whether it is marked at the Custom House?—Yes; but I do not see where the advantage would be in the quarters being marked at all. They are ticketed now at the various places they come from. The New Zealand mutton, the Canterbury mutton, the

Chairman—continued.

Swift's beef, the Morris' beef, all have their tickets on; and the meat is advertised in that manner.

3279. There is one other point which has been suggested, namely, the registering of shops, or having special counters in shops for the sale of foreign meat; what is your opinion about that; would it be practicable?—It would be rather awkward, because a lad might take a piece of meat from one counter to another, and a butcher might very easily innocently get into trouble. A party might be buying a piece of meat of each sort, and it would be almost impossible to keep it separate.

3280. Do you think it would be impossible after it was cut up into small pieces for an inspector even to tell which was foreign?—It would be almost impossible to tell the Birkenhead; in fact it is impossible to tell it at all times from our own meat, but the chilled, or frozen meat, is very easy to tell.

3281. Even if in small pieces?—Yes, because the fat has a red appearance, unless it be that our own meat, in this hot weather, has been in the refrigerators. The public in Leeds, at any rate, know very well what they are buying when they buy the frozen or chilled meat, and it seems to be marked well enough by the colour of it. The Committee have seen the South American cattle and have noticed the wide difference between them and the States cattle. There is much more difference between the frozen mutton and our own mutton than that, and I am sure that no butcher with a respectable trade would attempt to palm off a frozen leg of mutton for English, because the customer would have to have very great confidence in him to take it away. It is certain when they get the leg of mutton at home they would very soon find it out. They could find it out by handling it when it is frozen. As soon as the frost is out of it, the fat goes black-red and the meat is more flabby than our own altogether.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3282. I think you said your objections to this Bill are that it is not practicable and would harass the retail meat trade?—Yes.

3283. If, as is contemplated under this Bill, the meat were marked before it got into the hands of the retail trader, do you think it would harass him?—It would be no advantage in that case.

3284. It would not harass him, would it?—But every piece would not be marked then.

3285. Supposing a carcase of mutton comes into the hands of a retail trader with four or five marks upon it, which have been put on it perhaps before it came to this country at all, that would not harass the retail trader, would it?—It would not harass him in having the marks on, but it would harass him in this way: If a quarter of beef had been in the refrigerator all the week, and it was cut up, no inspector could tell the difference between that and the other that had been marked, so that he would be harassed indirectly.

3286. But he would be in a position to prove, would he not, that he had been buying British meat and keeping it in a refrigerator?—But if

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

he happened to have both kinds, then it would be rather difficult to prove that one was English and the other chilled meat.

3287. Are there many butchers in Leeds within your knowledge who keep foreign and British meat in the same shop?—Only a very few, who cut a low-priced article and sell it in the poorer districts at the very low price of from 2*d.* to 4*d.* a pound. The people who buy that meat do not care where it comes from so long as they get plenty for their money.

3288. In the case of the majority of butchers the difficulty you foresee would not arise, would it; because they would have all British or all foreign meat?—No, it would not.

3289. With regard to the supply of meat to Leeds, do you say there is a very small percentage of frozen or chilled meat coming into Leeds?—That is so.

3290. What is the great bulk of the meat consumed there?—English, Irish, and Birkenhead meat.

3291. Is the majority of it Birkenhead or British?—It varies a great deal according to the time of the year. At certain times of the year it is impossible to get supplied with British meat. In our market at certain seasons of the year we have double the number of cattle that we have at other seasons; when our markets are light, we have to fall on Birkenhead.

3292. Is there a large live cattle market in Leeds?—There is a large market, but there are not very many cattle shown in it; lately there have been about 500, and at times there would be 800.

3293. Where do the butchers get their English meat from; from other markets?—Yes, there are auction marts; and there is Wakefield market within nine miles.

3294. Is that a much larger market than Leeds market?—Yes, a much larger market; with 2,000 cattle.

3295. At what time of the year is there a deficiency in the supply in Leeds?—About this time of the year; fewer are shown just now than at any time.

3296. At some times of the year you have cattle which are fed in yards, and at other times you have grass-fed cattle, I suppose?—Yes, in the spring we get a great many Scotch, Yorkshire, and Northumberland cattle; we get a very few Irish in the spring, but we get a good number of Irish cattle and all grass cattle winnow to the end of the year. This time of the year is between the two seasons.

3297. So that a large proportion of the meat being consumed at Leeds during this week, for instance, is Birkenhead, is it not?—Yes.

3298. Do you get mutton from Birkenhead as well as beef?—Some; but not a very great amount.

3299. Is the supply of mutton pretty good all the year round?—Yes.

3300. Do the butchers who sell both classes of meat make much difference in the price?—At certain times of the year; that is to say, from now to Christmas I can buy English or Irish meat at less than the Birkenhead price, because it is not as good quality, as a rule. Anyone who wants a good thick bullock has a job to find it in the open market.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

3301. Is there great variation in the quality of the bullocks killed at Birkenhead?—There is a great difference between the American cattle and the South American cattle. I am speaking now of the States cattle, because no first-class butcher would think of cutting a South American unless he wants to destroy his trade. It is sold by butchers who charge a small price to fit the people who want the meat at a low price, and who are not so very particular about the quality.

3302. Do you think that to any great extent foreign meat is sold as English; that is to say, at the English price; if it is sold at all, do you think it is sold at such a low price that everyone knows what it is?—Do you mean the United States beef?

3303. I mean, is there any fraud takes place?—There is no fraud takes place. I have a number of shops myself, and I cut up both Birkenhead meat and English meat; but I tell my men to tell the customers what it is if they want to know. They very seldom want to know; they are satisfied as long as the meat is good.

3304. Of course, with regard to that, the price varies, does it not, according to the quality of the meat more than according to its place of origin, because it is not frozen at all?—That is so. If I cut poor meat in a first-class shop I should very soon lose my trade, let it be foreign or English.

3305. At certain times of the year is the Birkenhead beef really as good as anything there is on the market?—It is.

3306. This Bill does not propose that the Birkenhead beef should be marked; but if it is marked before it leaves Birkenhead would it interfere with your trade at all?—I believe that it would improve the trade for the foreign meat. I have a number of shops, and my neighbours advertise me remarkably well as being a very large buyer of Birkenhead meat. The consequence is, that wherever I have a shop I can do more trade than any of my neighbours through their advertisements. I believe I am selling three times as much as any other butcher in Leeds.

3307. How does your trade differ from that of your neighbours, who, I understand, are competing with you?—I bring a good deal from Birkenhead, and they play on it expecting to do me harm, but I find instead of doing me harm they do me good. I am a wholesale agent for Swift's meat, and for the last eight or nine months I have had this advertisement in the "Yorkshire Post" (*producing advertisement*).

Chairman.

3308. What is Swift's meat?—The chilled meat. During that time my trade has improved, and if the public had such a prejudice against the foreign meat, I think it would have been otherwise.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3309. Are the rival traders you speak of traders who deal in foreign meat, or home-grown meat?—

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

meat?—They are just the same; I do not think there is a butcher in Leeds who has not some of it at times.

3310. In what way does your trade differ from theirs?—Perhaps I do a little more trade than they do, both in the English and in the other sort.

3311. I thought you said your trade had improved, owing to the fact that you dealt in this foreign meat?—I believe the more you make to do about this foreign meat, the more you advertise it, and I believe if it was labelled the trade would improve in it. I remember when the American meat came in the chilled state years ago everyone seemed to want it.

3312. With regard to the frozen mutton, does a large quantity of that come to Leeds?—No, not a very large quantity.

3313. Can you speak of the trade in frozen meat?—It is sold in shops for what it is. The legs of mutton will vary from fourpence to fivepence per pound.

3314. I know there are certain shops which advertise themselves as dealing with colonial meat, but it is sold in other shops as well, is it not?—No, except in a few shops in the low part of the city, where I do not think they would cut any English meat unless it was a low-priced English meat.

Mr. *Briggs.*

3315. Really the fact is the frozen mutton does not go through your market in Leeds, but it comes direct from the importers and goes straight to the butchers, does it not?—That is so.

3316. There is no public market for it in Leeds, is there?—No.

3317. And, therefore, whatever finds its way to the butchers comes direct from the frozen meat stores to the man who buys it, and you would not see it?—We should see it in the shops, and it is easy to tell.

Chairman.

3318. Is it sold in the dead-meat market?—A few carcases, but very little.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3319. The trade in Leeds is very different to that in London, is it not, where an enormous quantity of this frozen meat is sold?—I do not know anything about London.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3320. Do you say that this Bill would advertise the foreign meat?—Yes.

3321. Your neighbours, you say, have advertised you as dealing in foreign meat, and your trade, you say, has increased and improved by that advertisement?—Yes.

3322. According to that, this Bill would increase and improve your trade still further; then how is it you come here to oppose it?—Because it is not needful.

3323. Do you not wish to improve your trade?—I do, but I oppose it as representing the Leeds Butchers' Association. I represent the butchers of Leeds.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

3324. Have you anything further to say in answer to my question?—No.

3325. You represent the butchers of Leeds, and you have come up in their interests to oppose this Bill, and to prevent your own trade increasing, have you; may I ask if that is to the interests of the butchers of Leeds?—I do not think I should prevent my own trade increasing, because if this Bill were passed it would advertise others as well as myself; I should not be the only dealer in it.

3326. You said that your trade increased by advertisement, therefore the more you can advertise the foreign trade, as this Bill would do, the more your trade would increase, would it not?—But I do not deal entirely in foreign meat; I deal a great deal in English meat as well; some weeks I slaughter more English cattle and sheep than any other butcher in Leeds.

3327. But you do not object to increasing your trade, do you?—It would not increase my trade any more than others, because I do not deal entirely in it; I deal in both sorts, English and foreign, and there are others who scarcely have anything else but Birkenhead meat in their shops.

3328. You say this Bill would increase the foreign trade, do you?—Yes.

3329. You have no objection, have you, to increasing your foreign trade?—But I do not have all the foreign trade. It would not do me any good in that way, because it would advertise others as well as myself. I am well advertised.

3330. Then, is your opposition to the Bill that you do not want to advertise yourself and do not want others to be advertised?—I say it would harass us altogether; it would be impossible to tell which was foreign and which was English.

3331. In what way would it harass you?—By the inspection, and the trouble of having to mark it, and looking after the marking; or if it has to be kept on two counters; all that would be very annoying. You would have to be continually watching it, because pieces would be moved from one counter to another when you have to wash down.

3332. You say it would be harassing to have it on two counters and to earmark the two; but did not you say that you gave special orders to your men that they should always tell a customer, if they asked, whether it was foreign or English?—That is so.

3333. If it is all mixed up together, and it would be harassing to keep it separate, how can they know?—They tell to the best of their ability.

3334. I suppose they are liable to be wrong; are they not?—If I send an English beast into a shop they know it is not a foreign beast; and perhaps at one shop I have all English, and at another all foreign.

3335. Do you keep your shops all separate?—No. The butcher would have a better idea whether it was foreign or not than the inspector, because he would see it in the whole quarter, and would know which piece was off a certain quarter, whereas the inspector would not know

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

that. When I refer to two counters, I mean that the meat might get mixed together.

3336. Do you mean it would get more mixed together if there were separate counters than it does now?—No, it could not get mixed more.

3337. Practically, it comes to this, does it not, that very often the assistants are not quite sure when a customer asks them the question. A piece of foreign meat might get mixed with English, and it would be difficult to tell?—That is so sometimes, because no one can tell.

3338. You said a large quantity of foreign meat in some of the shops was sold at 2*d.* a pound, and English meat as well; do you mean best English?—No; I said best English is not sold in those shops because people would not give more than 2*d.* a pound for it.

Chairman.

3339. Do you sell any inferior English meat at that price?—Yes, there is inferior English meat sold at that price; old cows and such like, which are a great deal worse than a lot of the foreign meat.

3340. From the advertisement you have shown, I suppose you sell practically more of the American meat than you do of the English?—No; I do not sell much of that at all; that is wholesale only; I do not cut it at all in my shop.

3341. You do not sell it retail, but you sell it wholesale, do you?—Yes.

3342. Do you do any wholesale trade in English meat?—Yes.

3343. How much, in comparison to what you do of the American?—Sometimes I sell 50 or 60 English beasts a week wholesale, and at another time, perhaps, I should sell more of the Birkenhead killed. I do not sell much of the chilled meat.

3344. Taking the chilled and the Birkenhead and English meat together during the whole year, what percentage of the meat you sell is English?—Perhaps about 40 per cent. is English.

3345. And the remaining 60 per cent. is foreign, is it?—Yes.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

3346. You said, did you not, that you were opposed to this Bill becoming law?—Yes.

3347. Are you in favour of the meat slaughtered at Birkenhead being passed on the public as British or Irish meat?—I am not in favour of it being marked; it would be harassing, but I do not think it is palmed off as English. The public buy it because they know it is good meat.

3348. Do you think, if meat marking is to take place at all, the cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead should be marked also?—I think the less marking the better, if any is to be marked at all.

3349. Do you say so chiefly on account of the trouble it would give to the retailers?—Yes; that, and it would be so difficult to tell the difference; of course it is the inconvenience it would be to the retailer.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

3350. Is that your main objection to the Bill?—It would be an inconvenience, and no advantage to anyone.

3351. That is only your opinion, is it not; if a simple system of marking could be devised, would that remove your objection?—I have never heard of any system that could be devised that would be satisfactory, because to mark every small steak and every chop would be impossible.

3352. If a simple method of marking could be devised, would that remove your objection to the Bill in any way?—No, we should object to it anyway, because it would be inconvenient and unworkable throughout. No one could tell the difference between the English and the Birkenhead-killed meat, and we should be harassed by the inspectors; it would be no use of having an army of inspectors without finding them something to do, and if they kept taking away pieces of meat we should perhaps be proving ourselves innocent, and getting the meat back when it would be worth very little, which would be a loss to us and inconvenient throughout. It would be impossible to prove whether the meat was English or foreign.

3353. You do not object to it because of any reduction it might make in your profits, do you?—No.

3354. Do you say that the States cattle landed at Birkenhead are better than the Irish cattle?—The Irish cattle lose in transit, and we in Leeds have a strong objection to buying the Irish cattle on account of the way they are knocked about; they are bruised, which has a tendency to make them go off their feed. An Irish bullock ought to be kept a fortnight before being slaughtered, and if we do that they lose a good deal of weight. If the Irish beast was dehorned it would be better.

3355. Have you formed any opinion as to the party upon whom the blame rests for the Irish cattle coming into this country in such bad condition?—We blame the shipping companies.

3356. Do you think the shipping companies are to blame for the bad condition in which Irish cattle arrive in this country?—If ever it is stormy weather there is always a bad trade for Irish cattle in Leeds market, because the butchers know when it has been rough weather Irish beasts are bruised, and they will not purchase them if they can get anything else.

3357. Then we have the remarkable fact that cattle brought from America are landed in better condition than cattle brought only three or four hours voyage?—Yes, because more care is taken of them.

3358. Do you think the blame rests with the steamboat companies?—I do.

3359. What about the railway companies?—The railway companies in this country are not as careful as they might be, but I do not know anything about them in Ireland. The cattle are not often bruised much on the railways.

3360. You stated that English cattle are deteriorating; how do you account for that?—I do not think we are improving the breeds as much as they are in foreign countries. The English breeder very often goes in for early maturity.

Mr. *MacAleese*—continued.

maturity. They try to have a beast fat and fit for the butcher at two years old or under. Those beasts are neither beef nor veal. The American cattle are mostly three or four years old and have more nutrition about them and are beef. There are others which come to the market half fat, and a very great number of that class of cattle come during one six months of the year especially.

3361. As far as the public are concerned, do you think they would require no protection from fraudulent retailers if there are fraudulent retailers in the trade?—I do not think there are any fraudulent retailers in Leeds.

3362. I am not speaking particularly of Leeds, but in London, for instance?—I do not know anything about London.

3363. You said, did you not, that you had not much acquaintance with Scotch beef?—I do not say so. We have a great amount of Scotch meat coming to Leeds in the spring of the year.

3364. Is it a superior meat?—It is the best meat.

3365. Do you think this Committee would be justified in recommending to the House of Commons to pass a Bill to protect the public who might not be able to differentiate between States meat and South American meat and Scotch meat?—I do not think the public want protecting, because they can tell the difference between the frozen and the English meat, and if they get a good article they are satisfied, whether it be American meat or English meat.

3366. Do you deal in bacon and hams?—No.

3367. Could the public be deceived in the case of bacon and hams?—I cannot say; I do not know anything about them. Bacon and hams I should say are very different to fresh meats.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3368. Do you say that you are the representative of the Butchers' Association in Leeds?—Yes.

3369. In the position you hold, have you the confidence, and do you feel that you can speak for a wider area than Leeds. Can you say that you represent the feeling of the rest of the towns in the district?—I should not like to say that. I represent them all, though I believe the feeling is very much similar to that in Leeds. I have heard people say they are entirely opposed to the Bill, but still I do not say I represent those places, because I do not.

3370. Do you consider you are able to say that their opinion is the same as that of Leeds?—The majority; I should not say all. I have never heard anyone in Yorkshire say they are in favour of the Bill, though I am not certain there are not some who are in favour of it.

3371. The area of which you speak, or rather of which you know, is a very large area, is it not?—Yes.

3372. You said that very inferior English meat was sold in low parts of the town. In your market do you find inferior foreign cattle being sold?—Yes; we have both sorts, but the inferior has to be sold at an inferior price. There is inferior foreign cattle as well as the best.

3373. Do you find cattle sent to this country

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

which have been probably draught cattle?—Probably some have been, but I do not think there are many; the South Americans are the worst quality cattle sent at present.

3374. This meat, you say, do you not, is sold in the lower parts of the town, and there is no need for the people buying it to ask whether it is foreign or English, because they can get as inferior English meat as foreign meat?—Yes, they do not care so long as it is cheap.

3375. What do you do as to veal at certain times of the year. Can you always get English veal?—No, a great deal of foreign veal comes during about three months from Rotterdam and Germany.

3376. Is that sold in first-class shops?—No, there is not so much of it sold in first-class shops. When a few good calves come they go to the first-class shops.

3377. Is foreign veal sold in first-class shops?—Only the very best.

3378. What about sweetbreads; what do you do as to them?—We do not get any from abroad.

3379. Do you think that the fact of having a shop registered for the sale of foreign and English beef would be in any way injurious to your trade?—I do not know that it would make any difference either way; because if it was a case of registering, and everyone who dealt in Birkenhead meat had to register, I believe nearly every butcher in Leeds would have to register.

3380. Do you think registration would apply to all the trade in Leeds?—Practically to all; that is to say, if it was for Birkenhead meat, not as to the chilled and frozen meat, that is sold for what it is worth in shops that practically sell nothing else.

3381. You have already, have you not, expressed your opinion generally that the effect of this Bill, if passed into law, would cause an advance of the foreign trade, because the quality of foreign meat is improving, and that good meat will always sell whatever the price may be?—That is so. It would be more beneficial to the foreign than to the English farmer.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

3382. What is the size of your association?—We represent practically all the principal butchers of Leeds; we have nearly 200 members, and it is one of the oldest butchers' associations in England.

3383. If registration were required, it is possible, is it not, that your association might make it a rule that no man should belong to the association unless he registered?—I cannot say anything about that. I do not know what we should do in that case; that has never been thought about.

3384. Is there any difference, in your experience, in the way the meat is dressed when it comes from Birkenhead or Scotland or Ireland?—There is a difference sometimes, but not always. There are lots of Leeds slaughtermen who work at Birkenhead at present, and, of course, if they were slaughtering any cattle for me they would slaughter them in my own way. Some-

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

times they are dressed in the style peculiar to London.

3385. Is there no special style of dressing?—Yes, there are different styles of dressing, but when the meat is cut up it would make very little difference. It is only butchers who can tell the difference between the Leeds style and the Manchester or Liverpool style.

3386. Might there be a Leeds or Manchester or Liverpool butcher at Birkenhead, who would dress it according to the style required?—Yes, if it was for Leeds they would dress it in the Leeds style, but if for Manchester in the Manchester style; it is done for the cutting; we all cut our meat differently, and we like it dressed in our own way, so that it is better to cut.

3387. Have you much tuberculosis at Leeds?—We have had a good deal of it at times.

3388. Have you had much loss from it?—Yes; there was a good deal of loss a few years ago; I lost two beasts myself.

3389. There is none among the Birkenhead cattle, is there?—I do not think I ever saw one affected.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3390. You said just now, did you not, that you could not speak for other places besides Leeds, but that you knew the district all round, and you had never heard anyone in the whole of Yorkshire who was in favour of the Bill; also that you represent an association of 200 members?—Nearly 200.

3391. Would it surprise you to hear that the York association has written a letter saying that they are unanimously in favour of the Bill?—I do not know anything about York.

3392. But you will not be able to say in future, will you, that you have not heard anyone in Yorkshire speak in favour of the Bill?—I cannot say so now, because I have heard you say so, and I have heard the letter read.

Chairman.

3393. I understand that you deal a good deal in imported meat?—Yes, both imported and English. Do you mean frozen and chilled meat?

3394. I meant generally?—I do sell chilled meat wholesale, but I do a good deal in the Birkenhead trade, especially at certain seasons of the year.

3395. Do you sell retail frozen and chilled meat as well as fresh meat?—Only in one little shop in a low neighbourhood, where I charge from 2*d.* to 4*d.* a pound.

3396. Do you, in your shop or shops, sell frozen meat at all?—I sell frozen meat in one shop only.

3397. Do you sell chilled beef?—Yes, in one shop.

3398. Do you sell Birkenhead-killed meat?—Yes.

3399. Do you sell also English-produced meat?—Yes.

3400. You sell the frozen and chilled meat in a shop separate from the English meat, do you?—That is so.

Chairman—continued.

3401. Do you sell the Birkenhead-killed meat in the English-meat shop or in the foreign-meat shop?—In the English shop.

3402. How many shops have you?—Fourteen, I believe.

3403. In different parts of the town?—Yes, they are mostly in Leeds. I should like to explain that I used to sell English in the shop I sell frozen meat in. There was a shop opened opposite where they sold legs of mutton at 4*d.* a lb., so I was obliged to sell frozen meat at my shop, because the people would not give me any more for the English than for the frozen meat. That is the reason I sell it in that shop.

3404. Do you think there would be any serious objection to its being made compulsory for retail butchers to sell the frozen and the chilled meat in separate shops, where they have more than one shop, from the English meat?—As far as Leeds is concerned that is practically done now. We always say it is no good putting it together.

3405. Do you, in your foreign-meat shop, put anything up, beyond the price, to show that it is frozen meat?—No; the people know very well by its appearance. I have another shop within about 300 yards of the shop I have spoken of where I charge double the price; it is in rather a better neighbourhood.

3406. Do you put up any advertisement that it is foreign meat, to attract customers?—No; the people who buy meat there simply want plenty for their money; they do not care whether it is foreign or not.

3407. Then you do not put any advertisement up, do you?—I do not put any advertisement up as to whether it is English or foreign; the people know without it.

3408. Do you put any tickets on pieces of your meat announcing it as New Zealand, or anything of the kind?—No.

3409. Then you give no indication whatever that it is foreign meat at all, do you?—No.

3410. The price speaks for itself, does it?—Yes.

3411. Do the people ever ask you whether it is foreign meat?—I daresay they will ask the men, and I always tell the men to state what it is.

3412. Do I gather from your experience that not only is there no difficulty in separating the two, but that you actually do it for your own trade purposes, because you think it best; would you see any objection, if it was made compulsory by law, in your case to put up a notice that a particular shop was set apart for the sale of foreign meat; would that interfere with your trade, or would it be an advantage or a disadvantage from your point of view?—I should say that it would make no difference at all, really.

3413. If the law was that you were to put up a notice that a particular shop was a foreign-meat shop, it would do you no harm?—I do not think it would do either good or harm to do it.

3414. Have you any shops where you sell the two together; that is to say, frozen and English meat?—No, only the shop I have spoken of. In the

Chairman—continued.

the other shops I sell home-killed meat. I do sell wholesale Swift's chilled meat.

3415. Along with the English wholesale meat?—I sell it to butchers; but of course a butcher would never think of buying it for English; he can tell the difference.

3416. When a retail butcher has not two shops do you see any practical difficulty in his keeping one part of the shop for frozen meat and another part of the shop for English-killed meat?—I think it would be very inconvenient, because when we have to wash the blocks down the meat has to be moved about, and it would be very liable to get mixed together; then the inspector might come in and find a piece on the wrong stall.

3417. Would not you know the difference yourself?—Yes.

3418. And if they got mixed could not you separate them?—But one of the lads who washed down might very easily put the meat together, and the inspector might pop in at the time; and there are times when even the chilled meat could not be told from some of our own. In weather like this, if we have a quarter of beef left, we send it to the refrigerator, and when it comes out in a week it would be impossible to tell it from the chilled meat. If that was laid on one stall board as English, the inspector might seize it, and it would be very inconvenient to the butcher if that meat was taken away and kept for a few hours, it might be worth nothing when it came back; and we think that would be very hard.

3419. If a law were passed that foreign meat was either to be marked or that there was some indication that a man did sell foreign meat, it would drive a great number of butchers who sold both to register themselves as foreign meat sellers, would it not?—I believe if it came to registering, practically the whole of the butchers of Leeds would register, because practically they all sell part foreign, that is, Birkenhead killed. At certain times of the year a first-class butcher cannot get the quality of meat that he requires

Chairman—continued.

in our open markets; that is to say, from now to Christmas.

3420. What do you say to this. A gentleman writes me with regard to what he calls a typical case, and he says: "I deal absolutely in nothing but the best Scotch and English meat, Aberdeen beef, mostly Scotch meat, with some English for larger points, Welsh when in season," and so on. "But most of our finest sweetbreads come from France. Must I give up selling them, or, to protect myself, supposing a Bill is passed, take out a license and dub myself a dealer in foreign meat." Is that a practical difficulty?—It would look like a difficulty.

3421. Have you any experience of sweetbreads?—No.

3422. Can you tell me why it is that a great quantity of sweetbreads come from France?—We do not get them in Leeds. The reason they come from France, I believe, is because they are said to be superior to our own. They have some manner of taking care of them, I believe.

3423. Is it the fact that they are better?—I have been given to understand so. They kill their calves differently, too.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3424. You said, did you not, that much of the meat imported into this country was ticketed now?—Yes.

3425. Do the Committee understand that between the time the meat changes hands between the wholesale men and the butchers, the tickets are torn off?—No, we leave those tickets on, and the sheets are on the meat.

3426. But when they are cut up in the shops, what is done?—When they are cut up the public would not take the mutton with the tags on.

3427. Then practically the tags are removed, are they, because the public will not take them?—They would not have them weighed, of course, and pay for them.

Professor JAMES W. ROBERTSON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3428. ARE you Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying for Canada?—Yes.

3429. What does a "Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying for Canada" exactly mean?—Practically the executive head of a Branch of the Department of Agriculture under the Minister.

3430. Can you speak on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada?—He has authorised me by cablegram to do so since I was called.

3431. Speaking on his behalf, do you say that he is of opinion that legislation for marking Canadian food products, such as butter, cheese, fruits, poultry, and eggs, in such a manner as to indicate that they were of Canadian origin would be thoroughly acceptable to the producers in Canada?—That is so. We are strongly in favour of any legislation that will designate Canadian products as Canadian products all the way through to the consumers.

Chairman—continued.

3432. Do you consider it practicable to mark eggs?—Yes, on the cases.

3433. But not on the eggs?—Not on individual eggs.

3434. So that it would only act as regards importation, would it not, that is to say, the wholesale men would be the only men who would know the place of origin?—But where eggs are shipped from Canada the cases would be in the shops of the retailers, and the word Canada there would be an advertisement of their place of origin, not only to the purchaser, but to the general public.

3435. Would the retailer serve the customer out of the boxes?—I have noticed that in some of the shops they do that, but in most instances they put the cases in a back shop, and put the eggs into a basket, or some other receptacle.

3436. So that they lose then, do they not, their indication of origin?—Yes, in some cases.

Chairman —continued.

3437. Poultry and fruit, I suppose you would say, should be marked in the same way?—Yes, on the cases only.

3438. Could butter be marked separately?—The law now requires that every case containing butter for export shall be marked with the word "Canadian." That law was passed in the last Session of Parliament.

3439. Do you mark an individual cheese?—Yes, on the box, and also on the rind of the cheese.

3440. On the top and bottom?—It is not specified where, except that it must be on the cheese in letters three-eighths of an inch high.

3441. Do you mark meats?—There is no compulsory legislation as to that, although the Canadian bacon is nearly all marked.

3442. Is there any meat sent from Canada to this country?—The first shipment only came about three weeks ago.

3443. What was that?—Chilled beef.

3444. That is not marked, as I understand, is it?—It is marked only on the cloth covering the meat.

3445. The producers in Canada, not only because there is legislation making it compulsory, like to mark the place of origin of all their products as far as they can, do they?—That is what our producers think would be desirable in every way.

3446. Do they do it voluntarily in some of these cases?—It has been voluntary; but now to ensure that our products will be known by their own name, Parliament passed a law compelling it in the case of butter and cheese.

3447. So that Parliament is merely carrying out what is the wish of the producers?—Public opinion was strongly in favour of that.

3448. May I take it that the reason why you want to do that is that you think it is a mode of advertising your products?—Partly so, and partly because we think that anything which lets the consumer know what he is buying establishes a permanent trading connection, which is of great value; it becomes a kind of trade mark, and an assurance of a steady demand for that article.

3449. Assuming that it is good, people would ask for that particular thing?—At the price it can be sold at.

3450. Of course if you sent over bad products it would not do you any good, would it?—It would certainly prevent the making of any more of that kind of stuff; one object requiring that cheese be branded "Canadian" is, that other countries sometimes make imitation cheese; the law in Canada entirely prohibits the manufacture and the sale of that cheese; and, at the same time, lest Canadian cheese might be confounded with other cheese, Parliament passed a law that it should be marked with the word "Canadian."

3451. Is there anything special in the make of Canadian cheese?—You can easily tell the difference between Canadian and English or Scotch cheese from the outside appearance.

3452. Have you a law that the word "Canadian" or "Canada" must be marked on each box or package of cheese or butter destined for export, and in the case of cheese on the cheese itself, before it is taken from the factory where it is made?—That is the law now.

Chairman—continued.

3453. Is the marking done by the producer before it leaves the factory?—Yes.

3454. Is it an offence to send out any cheese or butter without that being done?—Yes, it is an offence punishable by a fine of not less than five dollars a box, and not more than 20 dollars a box.

3455. In the case of butter, can they send out any without its being in a box or package?—No, it cannot be exported.

3456. What do you say as to the suggestion that your Canadian meat and cheese should be classed as foreign when it comes into this country?—We think that would be quite unfair.

3457. Would you like it to be marked in some way as Colonial?—We prefer to have the specific designation of the colony, such as Canadian, not because the products of other colonies are inferior, but because they are different and come at different seasons of the year.

3458. Then what you actually want is that it shall be marked Canadian, and the producers would take their chance of its making its way in the market, would they?—That is what we prefer. And that the article should win its way by its own merits, which we think it has.

3459. Do you view Canadian meats and other products as British?—Yes, we do, because we ourselves are British, and we have conditions similar to the British Isles in climate and soil, the things which make qualities.

3460. Therefore do you object to dealers in Great Britain who might sell Canadian products being required to be registered as dealers in foreign articles?—We object to the designation "foreign" as being applied to a dealer in Canadian products.

3461. Have you any objection to them being registered as sellers of Canadian products?—None whatever; we would rather welcome legislation of that kind.

3462. You say the object of this Bill, you think, might be gained if any dealer selling British meats, that is, meats from Great Britain and Ireland, were also allowed, without restriction, to sell Colonial meats, and if every dealer in foreign meats and cheeses was required to be so registered and his shop so designated. Do you think that those who sell British meats should also be allowed to sell Colonial meats and Colonial products generally without any restriction whatever except the indication which would be provided when the Canadian products came to this country?—Quite so.

3463. But that he should not be required to register or give any notice whatever?—Nothing further than is required for the sale of British meats, such as meats grown in Great Britain.

3464. Do you think it is desirable that a dealer in foreign meats and cheeses, that is, meats and cheeses which come from countries other than Great Britain and Ireland, and other than our colonies, should be registered?—We think it would be desirable that the meats and cheeses should be designated at least. The matter of registration is a matter of the application of the law here with which I am not conversant.

Chairman—continued.

3465. Do you advocate some distinction being made in this country in some way or other between foreign meats and cheeses, and English and Colonial products?—I do, for this reason, that in my own inquiries I find while the wholesale men handle the foreign meats as foreign meats, the ultimate consumer buys them under the impression that he is buying the best English or the best Scotch, very often, and sometimes buys, in the case of cheese, under the impression that he is buying Canadian cheese.

3466. Did you say there was much meat shipped from Canada?—There is a large number of cattle of Canadian origin sent to Deptford, Birkenhead, and other ports.

3467. Do you think when you send more shipments of chilled meats to England it will be sold in the shops for English meat?—That is our fear, unless there be some means taken to prevent it.

3468. Do you want it to be marked "Canadian"?—Yes. If it be sold as the best English the consumer pays more than he would be otherwise required to pay for it, and we do not get that profit in Canada.

3469. Would you like to see, and do you advocate, every effort being made in this country that would prevent Canadian products from being sold under any other name except that of Canadian?—That is our policy, and we would give every assistance towards doing that by requiring that all Canadian products should be marked with the word "Canadian."

3470. You say, "It might be of practical service to the Committee to hear what the Canadian Department of Agriculture is doing to promote the delivery of Canadian products under their own name, in the best condition in Great Britain; will you tell the Committee what you can about that?—In the matter of dairy products, the Canadian Parliament has entirely prohibited the making or selling of all imitation products, so that there is no oleo-margarine or filled cheese made in Canada. Then we have regulations requiring that all United States products exported from a Canadian port should be branded with the words, "Produce of the United States." We do that at our expense, so as to ensure that anything going from our ports from United States sources would not be called by Canadian names.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3471. Do they go from Montreal?—Yes, largely; going through from Chicago; large quantities of butter, boxed-meats, meats and cheese also. We keep a man specially to watch any doubtful lots of cheeses lest some filled cheese might come that way.

Chairman.

3472. Do I understand that you prohibit the importation of margarine or filled cheese?—Entirely.

3473. Is it an offence to import it or sell it?—Yes; in addition to that, though it hardly touches the matter of marking, Canadian products of the more perishable kinds, such as butter, poultry, and eggs, have been partly spoiled in transportation, not by reason of distance, but by reason of the condition in which they arrive from want of cold storage; and the Government, to ensure that Canadian products shall win a place on their merits, has provided a system of cold storage from the interior. In connection with that the aim and regulations are to insist on the marking of everything carried that way with the word "Canadian;" so that the products will arrive here in their best condition, and by reason of their own merits win their own place.

Chairman—continued.

3474. I understand the Government have taken very great pains to provide a system by which all Canadian products shall come to the coast and be transported to England in the best possible condition?—Yes, the Government has arranged with the railways for a weekly cold storage service, and also with the steamships.

3475. Do they subsidise the railways for that?—To this extent only: that in many localities the quantity of produce offered was not sufficient to ensure a regular cold storage service, and the Government agreed to guarantee the railway companies that each trip would ensure a certain amount of earnings, and the earnings of the freight are credited towards the guarantee.

3476. They have thought it worth while, have they, to give State funds, where it is necessary, in order to ensure this good service and protect the products from deterioration?—Yes, they have done that, and during the past few years with very gratifying success, as shown by the expansion of trade and the improvement in prices.

3477. Has the price of your products been rising of late years?—The price of butter has been rising as compared to the relative price formerly obtained; and hereafter we expect to find that Canadian butter will command quite as good a price as the best butter from Denmark.

3478. How does it stand now?—From 4*s.* to 6*s.* per cwt. under it, mainly because the Danish butter has been so much advertised.

3479. Can you tell me what progress has been made in the rise of price during the last 10 years of Canadian butter; has it doubled in price?—It has not gained in price very largely, but it has relatively; there has been a general fall in the market prices of all products.

3480. Relatively, has it increased?—Yes; we have come up 20*s.* a cwt. in butter within the last four years relatively to Denmark, and we have more than trebled the exports in three years by this improved transport service.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3481. When you speak of the Danish butter, do you speak of it as it is sold here?—Yes.

Chairman.

3482. Are you speaking of the price in this country which you get from the importer?—Yes; we compete with the Danes here, and we have come that much nearer by having our butter delivered in better condition. Then I might say in that connection that the policy of the Department of Agriculture is based on this plan, that if Canadian products are brought here in their very best condition they will get the best class of customers, because there is no country outside Greater Britain and Ireland that has as good climatic and soil conditions for producing these fine products. We recognise in

Chairman—continued.

Canada that for every increased dollar's worth of exports we are able to make, we can buy about 60 cents' worth of things from Great Britain; so that ships get traffic both ways.

3483. Do you think you beat us in England in these agricultural products?—I do not think so; I think we can supply a product now that is nearly as good as English, by protection through cold storage in their transit.

3484. Your aim is to equal the English, is it not?—If we can do that we shall be thoroughly satisfied; and for the reason that the products are so much like the English in quality we would desire, that any registration requirement would permit the English, Scotch, Irish, Canadian, and Colonial product to be sold together.

3485. But still you want your distinguishing mark, do you not, so that it may take its place in the market according to its merits?—Yes. If I may use this illustration, there is a very strong prejudice in England in favour of things that are labelled "Best Scotch" and "Best English." I examined a lot of cheese the other day that sold at 62*s*., Scotch cheddars; they were not intrinsically appreciably better than the best Canadian, but they sold for 20*s*. a cwt. more because they were sold as "Best Scotch." We think the producers are entitled to get the extra price for the prejudice, but we think the best Canadian would by-and-by have a similar prejudice in its favour.

3486. Have you any experience of Scotland?—I have been there very often.

3487. Have you any experience of farming in Scotland?—I was brought up on a farm in Scotland.

3488. Therefore you know the Scottish system and products very well?—Yes, I know both products and methods of operation.

3489. Are you also acquainted with the methods of English farming?—Only by coming here several times on official matters and looking into the methods. We have a system in Canada of experimental farms illustrating how farmers might do various things, and the Government maintains them.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3490. I presume Canadians would very much resent having the products of Canada classed with foreign goods in Great Britain?—Yes, we would.

3491. Would you probably consider it still more unfair, since you have shown yourselves ready to give us preferential treatment as against other countries?—We think it would be rather unfair, and rather an unhappy answer to our offer.

3492. Is there any standard required for these cheese and butter goods before they are marked? None whatever. The Department of Agriculture has furnished information, both through publications and inspectors, to enable the producers to make the best quality; but there is no official inspection.

3493. The only guarantee is that they are not artificial?—Yes, that is provided against.

3494. I see there is a great deal of American cheddar sent over?—Yes; the system of making

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

cheese in Canada is the cheddar system, which is different from other systems. The word "cheddar" does not designate a locality, but a system of manufacture.

3495. The Committee had a witness before them who was very indignant at the use of the word "cheddar" as applied to any cheese except that made in this country. What do you say as to that?—The method of manufacture was first practised at the village of Cheddar, but it has become a name which indicates the system of manufacture merely.

3496. At present all Canadian cheese is marked, is it not?—With "Canadian" only.

3497. Do you not put "cheddar" after it?—No, because it is practically the only system adopted in Canada of making cheese. The cheddar system is different from the Cheshire system, different from the Gruyere, and different from the Gorgonzola systems of making.

3498. You do not put the word "cheddar" on?—No, and never have done.

3499. Can you give the Committee any idea of the number of cattle that comes to Birkenhead?—The exports from Canada to Great Britain now are about 100,000 live cattle per year, varying from one year to another according as the season may be suitable.

3500. Have you any idea of the numbers that come to Birkenhead altogether?—I could furnish it, but I have not it with me now. They come to Bristol, Glasgow, and London as well. We are only beginning our chilled-meat business.

3501. Has the live cattle trade been going on for many years?—Yes, it has been going on quite extensively for 12 years.

3502. Have your stock-breeders in Canada been importing English sires?—Yes, and also obtaining them from those breeding large herds of thorough-bred cattle in Canada; and with our climate the quality is very well maintained.

3503. Of course, there are no means of marking those?—Unless they were marked here at the slaughter-house.

3504. But there would have to be arrangements for slaughtering those separate from those that came from the States or the Argentine, would there not?—A very few inspectors at the abattoir could designate Canadian or United States or Argentine beasts.

3505. Are the cattle marked in any way?—No, not at all to designate them as Canadian.

3506. Is the chilled meat marked in any way?—Only on the covering; we have not yet discovered any practicable method of marking chilled beef; we should be very glad to hear of any way in which it could be done.

3507. The Committee noticed that many of the cattle in the Deptford lairage were lug-marked; is that generally done, do you know?—It is not common in Canada; the various shippers mark them on the rump and side by clipping the hair. Sometimes they are marked by ear labels, but that is not the rule in shipping cattle.

3508. If it were possible, would you desire that live cattle should be specially marked "Canadian"?—Only if the carcase could be so designated

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

designated that the consumer would know that it was Canadian when he bought it.

Chairman.

3509. You see no value, do you, in marking the cattle "Canadian," when the only person who would know it would be the person at the port of disembarkation?—Yes, quite so.

3510. That does not matter to you; it is the consumer whom you wish should know, is it not?—Yes.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

3511. If you could reach the consumer you would be very glad to do so, would you not?—Very glad, hoping by-and-by our products would be known by their names, and take their place under their names.

3512. How do the Canadian cattle compare with the States cattle?—They are really finer as to the meat, but they are not so heavy as a rule. The feeding of all live stock in Canada is on mixed foods rather than any single food, like Indian corn, and that is perhaps what has gained for Canadian meat the very first place in this market.

3513. I am given to understand that your cattle are singularly free from tuberculosis; is that so?—Not wholly free, but I think much more so than the cattle of either Great Britain or the northern European countries, as far as I have read the reports.

3514. Are they examined in any way before they are shipped?—Yes; all the cattle are examined by the chief veterinary inspector of the Department; and we allow no cattle to be imported unless they have undergone the tuberculosis test.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3515. I understand you are simply anxious to compete in your own name against the world; is that so?—That is the preference we expect.

3516. As far as your views are concerned in favour of this Bill or otherwise, if you are at all in favour of this Bill, is it because it would insure the marking of your goods with the name of your colony, and so deliver them to the world under that name?—Quite so.

3517. Has the fact that you are not allowed now to export any store stock to this country made any difference in the way in which your dairy work has been carried out in Canada. If you were only allowed to send into this country live fat cattle would it make any alteration of the way in which you carry out dairy work in Canada?—I do not think it would, but it would affect our live cattle trade to a considerable extent, in this way: that when the cattle must be slaughtered at the port where they arrive, if there be a glut of cattle and a dull market there is no alternative sale for them. Formerly the English or Scotch farmers could buy those cattle, keep them for a month or more, and give us an alternative market, which was of very great advantage.

3518. Then you do not look upon the passing of that regulation with any favour, I suppose?—We do not, especially in this way: that the ostensible reason for its passage, as announced

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

to us, was the fear that Canadian cattle had pleuro-pneumonia, which we know they never had.

3519. I was thinking, perhaps, that it might make some difference in the way of your devoting more of your energies now to the dairy and cheese business rather than to the rearing of store stock for exportation?—That is a far better business for Canada; at the same time we send over fattened Canadian cattle alive, but after a long railway journey and a long ocean voyage such cattle would pick up in weight quickly and greatly, with three or four weeks' pasturage, which gave us an alternative market from British farmers as buyers.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

3520. You say you want your products marked "Canadian" because you yourselves are British, do you not?—We want them not marked foreign, because we are British.

3521. How are you British?—We are British in origin, British in allegiance, and British in character in every sense.

3522. Is there no element in Canada but the British element?—I do not know of any.

3523. Is there any Irish element?—Yes, also a Scotch element; and both are British.

3524. Is there a French element?—Yes. May I say one word: that while we have the French, whom we esteem very highly, they claim to be quite as British as we do.

3525. But they cannot be British, can they?—In our country people speak of England as a market for products. We have been contending for the use of the word Britain rather than for England.

3526. Do you think that the marking of eggs could be carried out?—We do not see how "Canadian" could be marked on the eggs; but on the cases, yes.

3527. But marking the cases would be no protection, would it; for instance, a dealer could take the Canadian eggs out of the case and put in eggs of an inferior quality?—There is that risk.

3528. And the same with butter?—It would seem to us in Canada as being a desirable thing that any dealer or seller who should label or ticket anything as "best English," "best Scotch," or "best Irish," and not be able to prove the source of origin, should be counted guilty of misdemeanour.

3529. You have a strong objection, I understand, to Canadian products being marked foreign, because Canada is not a foreign country?—That is so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3530. With regard to cheese, you said, did you not, that you marked the rind as well as the outside of the case?—Yes.

3531. The other day, when the Committee went to Messrs. Reynolds' and saw a number of cheeses, I did not notice any mark on the rind?—The Act I am speaking of only came into force about the 1st of July this year.

3532. Do you know how it is proposed to mark on the rind?—By a stencil or a rubber stamp with letters not less than 3-8ths of an inch high and one quarter of an inch wide. The law does not require marking by

 indentation;

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*--continued.

indentation; it only requires that the marking should be indelible and legible.

3533. And the law requires, does it, that the cheese should be marked "Canadian"?—Yes.

3534. With regard to the marking of meat, you said you wished to have it marked; do you mean you wish to have it marked this side of the water, or that you undertake to mark it in Canada?—We undertake the marking now on the covering, and we would be very glad if any method of marking the dressed beef, or even the beef from Deptford, could be devised here.

3535. Have you had an opportunity of seeing any of the evidence which has been given before this Committee?—No.

3536. Because one of the first witnesses explained the method which was adopted in Belgium of aniline dye; would the freezing take that marking out, do you think?—I think not; the beef from Canada would not be frozen in any case, but chilled only.

3537. With regard to butter, do you know of practice which exists, I am sorry to say, in this ountry that a large amount of butter which comes from the colonies or abroad is taken by butter merchants to butter factories and a small percentage of English butter mixed up with it, and it is all sold as English; do you know of that system?—I have heard of that being done.

3538. Does your law make it necessary to mark Canadian butter?—Yes, on the package in each case.

3539. But that would still allow of the packages going to these places, and its all being mixed up together, would it not?—Yes, if anyone chose to do that after obtaining possession of it.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3540. Did you state that the trade in chilled beef was only just beginning?—The first shipment in refrigerator compartments came only three weeks ago, or less.

3541. So that you can hardly say yet how far the trade is likely to be developed, can you?—Our hope is that it will grow to be a large trade, and save the shrinkage of the cattle on the ocean and some of the expense of transporting the live animals.

3542. Do you think it will be a more profitable trade than the trade in live cattle?—Yes, in so far as that there would be a saving in transport; but in the meantime the beef from the Deptford-slaughtered cattle is sold, if not ostensibly, without question as English or Scotch beef; whereas our chilled beef could not be sold as such, because of the difference in the appearance.

3543. What is at present the state of the law with regard to the chilled beef which is now beginning to come over?—In Canada there is no law requiring the marking of that; it is left entirely to be managed by commercial men, as they see fit.

3544. Do you think that if a law were to be passed indicating that it was to be marked in some way, it would harass the trade in any way, or that there would be a difficulty about it?—As far as Canada is concerned, we think that if a law be passed requiring that the chilled beef be marked, it should also require that the beef from Canadian cattle killed on this side should be marked.

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

3545. So that you would have all treated alike. You would have the carcases of the beasts slaughtered in Canada marked, and you would have the carcases of cattle which are brought over alive to Deptford or Birkenhead marked too, would you?—That would be our preference, if it could be done.

3546. So that there should be no doubt in either case as to what the meat really was. You want fair competition, do you not, between all the different classes of meat?—Certainly, and no misrepresentation, either ostensibly or impliedly.

3547. You wish Canadian products to be sold here generally on their merits, do you?—Yes.

3548. And do you think that the quality of the Canadian products is so high that they will obtain an increased trade here?—I do; and I think that as any defects are revealed the producers in Canada will improve their methods of production to the extent of meeting the requirements here.

3549. Have you had an opportunity since you have been in this country of making any inquiries with regard to the way in which the retail trade in meat is carried on?—Not very much this time, but a good deal when I was here five years ago.

3550. What conclusion did you come to with regard to the sale of British and foreign meat?—That at least four-fifths of the beef from Canadian fed cattle was ultimately sold and eaten as the best Scotch or the best English; not specially advertised or labelled as such, but ultimately bought by the consumer and eaten by him under that assumption.

3551. Did you hear the evidence given by Mr. Stephenson this morning about the retail trade in Leeds?—Yes, I was here.

3552. You do not altogether agree with it, do you?—I agree with this: that if no questions are asked the buyer buys good beef and gets such beef as there is there, perhaps under the impression that he is getting Scotch or English, while he is buying beef which is fed and grown on some colonial or foreign soil. That is my conclusion after very full inquiries made five years ago, and visiting a great many butchers' shops, examining the beef, asking what they kept and sold, and watching the source of supply afterwards.

Chairman.

3553. Do you think it matters to the consumer where the beef comes from as long as it is good?—Only this: that people are willing to pay an extra price to gratify their prejudice for something which is British in name. You find that in the cheese trade, the bacon trade, and a great deal in the beef trade.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3554. If you are considering the question of how far any fraud is carried on, it is a good deal a question of price, is it not. Do you think that much foreign meat is sold over here at the price of the best English meat?—Yes, I think so, retail; that is to say, meat of foreign origin killed on this side is retailed at precisely the same price as the best English and the best Scotch; and as far as I can tell by examination

it

Mr. *A. H. Smith*—continued.

it is perhaps quite as good as any except perhaps the best Scotch.

3555. If it is as good of course there would be no fraud in selling it at the same price, would there?—Only the fraud of misrepresenting the name.

3556. Is it often labelled in the shops with any name?—I do not know that the exact pieces are labelled, but there is stuck over the windows "Best English," "Best Scotch," and not a single intimation that any of it is of Canadian or other origin. There is certainly then deception as to the source of origin.

3557. If you sell chilled beef of equal quality to the best English available, there is no fraud in selling that at the same price as the English, is there, if nothing is asked about the origin, and if no label is stuck up?—Quite so; there would be no fraud in that case.

3558. But if the labels are stuck up, that clearly is a deception?—Yes; and for that reason we would welcome any action which would impose on the retailer the onus of proving that the beef which he labelled "Best English," or "Best Scotch," was of that origin. That would not seem to be very difficult to manage.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3559. Would you consider it a fraud if those labels, "United States of America," were taken off before the meat was hung up in the butcher's shop?—It would be perhaps not a fraud with regard to the value received for the money, but a misrepresentation which might affect the trade.

3560. Misrepresentation might affect the price, might it not?—Yes, and also the continuity of demand afterwards.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3561. You said something about the word cheddar, and the Committee have had several discussions about it; is it, in your view, merely a description of cheese, or a mark of origin?—It is now, I think, entirely a description of the method in which they are made, because Scotch cheddars are commonly quoted in the market; that is, cheese made in Scotland by the cheddar method. Of course, Cheddar is the name of the village in England where it was first made.

3562. Is it not the case that a decision has been given in a court of law recently with regard to that?—I am not aware of that. In Canada we define the method by the word Cheddar as distinguished from Stilton methods. Stilton cheeses are made in many places apart from Stilton.

Chairman.

3563. Your cheese is labelled "Canadian," and not "Canadian Cheddar," I understand?—That is so.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3564. Is the cheese made in Canada according to the cheddar manner marked "Canadian" or "Canadian Cheddar"?—It is marked "Canadian."

3565. Was that in consequence of any action taken by the Customs authorities?—No; the word cheddar has not been marked on Canadian cheese to my knowledge in any case.

3566. Has cheese made in the United States been marked "Cheddar"?—Not to my knowledge, although I think cheese is designated here in shop windows as Canadian Cheddar; but it is not so marked in Canada.

3567. The word cheddar is never used in Canada itself, is it?—Not in commerce, but it is used always in instructions as to methods of manufacture, to designate the process; it is not a market designation.

Chairman.

3568. Have you seen the Bill which is before the Committee?—Yes.

3569. As I understand your evidence with regard to the Bill, you would object to the clause which defines foreign meat because it defines foreign meat as "all meat which shall be imported into any part of Great Britain and Ireland from any country or place beyond the limits of Great Britain and Ireland," and that would make Canadian meat foreign?—Yes.

3570. Do you object to that clause?—I object to that clause.

3571. You are in favour, are you not, of the clause which refers to British or Irish meat, meaning meat killed within the United Kingdom, wherever it comes from?—Yes, with the qualification that Canadians would prefer to have the cattle coming from Canada and killed here designated as Canadian beef, rather than British or Irish beef.

3572. With regard to the main object of the Bill, which is the marking of foreign meat (that means from other countries than our own country and the Colonies), I understand that you are in favour of the objects of the Bill?—And in favour of the principle.

3573. Your only difference with the Bill is that you think Canadian products ought to be treated as British and not as foreign?—Yes, and designated as Canadian or British.

Mr. JAMES M. SINCLAIR, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3574. ARE you superintendent of exports for the Victorian Government?—Yes, I am.

3575. Are you here to give evidence on behalf of the Victorian Government?—Yes, I am here to give evidence on behalf, not alone of the Victorian Government, but Queensland, New South Wales, and South Australia.

Chairman—continued.

3576. Are you in a position to give evidence with regard to all the Australian Colonies?—Yes.

3577. Is that because you know that the opinion of the Victorian Government is the same as that of the other Colonies on the subject which is before this Committee?—Yes.

3578. So that the Committee may take you

Chairman—continued.

as giving evidence on behalf of all those Colonies, but not of New Zealand?—That is so.

3579. Have you seen the Bill which is before the Committee?—Yes.

3580. Do you take objection to the clause which would make meat and other products coming from Australia foreign products?—Yes; on behalf of the whole of the Australian Colonial Government I was asked to protest against Section 15 designating as foreign meat anything coming from the Australian Colonies.

3581. Did you hear the evidence of the last witness?—Yes.

3582. Do you agree with him on that point?—Yes, distinctly so. I may state that there was a conference of the Ministers of Agriculture of Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and New South Wales, held at Sydney in May last, and a communication was sent to the various Agent-Generals asking them if this Bill, which is at present being dealt with, was likely to pass, to guard the interests of the colonies, and to see that the brand "Australian" was used in the place of "Foreign."

3583. Do you at present mark any of your products distinctly Australian, or only with the name of the particular colony, as we have heard in the case of Canada?—We do so in Victoria, and the practice is also being followed in New South Wales and South Australia.

3584. Is that compulsory?—Not absolutely so, but in regard to butter, all butter pretty well is marked at the present time.

3585. You have no law, have you, compelling people to mark their products "Australian"?—No; but there is a Bill being dealt with; in fact it was brought before the last Federal Convention; called an Exports Bill, whereby agricultural products exported from the colonies would be dealt with on a uniform basis of inspection prior to shipment.

3586. And marking?—And also marking.

3587. May I take it that the Victorian Government, as far as this Bill is concerned, is rather tending in the direction of having the same regulations as in Canada with regard to marking the places of origin?—Yes.

3588. And I suppose I may take it, for the same reasons as we have heard given in the case of Canada. Do you wish your own products to be marked as much as they can when they come here, so that they may obtain a character, and are you willing to stand or fall by the character they do obtain?—Yes.

3589. But that is only in the form of a Bill at present, is it not?—That is only in the form of a Bill at present.

3590. Do you think it will pass?—Undoubtedly so.

3591. Is the popular opinion in favour of it?—Yes.

3592. Is that the case also in other of the colonies do you think, as far as popular opinion is concerned?—Undoubtedly so.

3593. But they have not got as far as a Bill?—No.

3594. But you think it is tending in that direction, do you?—Yes, and I may say with certainty that the Bill will pass.

Chairman—continued.

3595. Are you also of opinion that the other colonies will probably adopt the same regulations gradually?—Yes.

3596. You are prepared, are you not, to give some statistics with regard to the magnitude of the Australian frozen meat trade with Great Britain?—Yes; I can give you a short statement of it. The shipments of mutton commenced in 1880, with a total consignment for that year of 400 carcases. This trade has developed so much that last year Australia exported to the United Kingdom 1,613,523 carcases.

3597. In 16 years it has increased from 400 to 1,613,523 carcases, has it?—Yes.

3598. Is that all frozen meat?—Yes. Up to the middle of the present month this year 926,450 carcases of mutton arrived from Australia.

3599. Is this the season when they are exported principally?—No, our mutton arrives chiefly here during your winter months.

3600. Then if I double that figure of 900,000 should I get an idea of the exports for this year?—No, not this year, on account of the export being affected by the drought. Last year the increase in weekly arrivals rose to from an average of 18,000 to 30,000 carcases; frozen beef exports from Australia to the United Kingdom increased from 100,000 cwts. in 1889 to 517,000 cwts. in 1896. From Australia to London, engaged in the frozen meat trade at the present time, there are 58 refrigerator steamers; these are fitted with the latest and most improved machinery, and have a total carrying capacity each voyage of 1,689,000 carcases of mutton. Several of the new steamers built for this trade can carry 80,000 carcases each. It cannot be said that this enormous trade has been built up at the expense of the British agriculturist when official returns of price obtained for English sheep at the Metropolitan Meat Market show that in 1895, 5*s.* 4*d.* to 5*s.* 11*d.* per stone of 8 lbs. were the averages realised for first and second quality, against 5*s.* 2*d.* to 5*s.* 8*d.* for the same in 1885. This shows that in the face of the great importations of Australian frozen meat, prices for English grown were better on the average in 1895 than ten years previously.

3601. Do you send any live cattle or sheep to be slaughtered here?—No.

3602. Is your whole trade confined to the frozen meat?—Yes.

3603. You have a system of stock inspection, have you not?—Yes.

3604. Is that carefully carried out?—It is. With regard to live stock inspection there is a uniform system throughout the whole of the colonies; the various colonies are divided into districts, and there are live stock inspectors appointed for each. These men are qualified veterinary surgeons, and they have to report on the health of the stock from time to time.

3605. Have you great freedom from disease?—Yes, we have. The dry atmosphere of the colonies and the cattle feeding on natural pastures and no stall or artificial food I think are the chief reasons for that.

3606. Have you ever had any serious epidemics?—No, we have not.

3607. I suppose if any sheep or cattle are infected,

Chairman—continued.

infected, the inspector deals with them by slaughtering them, does he not?—Yes.

3608. You have had no great epidemics, have you?—No; many years ago we had scab in sheep, that was 30 years ago, and it was entirely eradicated.

3609. You have immunity from disease, partly owing to the climate, and partly owing to your system of inspection, you say?—Yes.

3610. Is dead meat inspected before it is shipped?—Yes, it is.

3611. Has it to be inspected by law?—Yes, and it has to be passed by the inspector.

3612. Is that the case with regard to all the colonies?—Yes.

3613. Has your price improved of late years for frozen meat?—There has been very little difference in price during the last few years.

3614. How long has the frozen meat trade been in existence?—The first shipments were made in 1880, but you may say during the last 10 years.

3615. Take the first 10 years from 1880 to 1890, and on from 1890 to 1896, has there been no improvement in the price the producer has got?—There have been fluctuations from time to time, but there has been no great rise.

3616. Has there been any relative improvement as compared with other meat?—No.

3617. The Government take great care, do they not, through their inspectors, as to all the meat exported to this country?—Yes.

3618. Do you export to other countries as well as to England?—Yes, we supply different ports in the Mediterranean with frozen meat, Malta, Gibraltar, and Port Said; we also ship considerably to South Africa.

3619. Do you ship to France or Germany?—Queensland does a certain amount of trade with France in beef; they have now got a cold store at Havre.

3620. Why only Queensland?—There were contracts made with reference to beef with the Queensland exporters.

3621. By the French Government?—Yes, I believe there were some contracts with the French Government.

3622. Do you send any cheese to England?—No, we export very little cheese from the colonies. Our exportation of butter is very large though.

3623. Do you mark that in any way on the cases?—Yes, the Victorian butter has to pass through a Government cold store; it all arrives at a large store in Melbourne, is there inspected by Government inspectors, and all up to a certain standard receives the Department of Agriculture's stamp on the boxes. It is then carried under Government contract by steamships to this country.

3624. How does it stand in price, compared with Denmark butter?—Sometimes it makes equal value to the Danish, but generally it is 3*s.* or 4*s.* under.

3625. Is the quantity very large?—From Victoria alone we have been shipping up to 1,000,000*l.* worth of butter. We started exporting butter in 1889, and shipped in that year 826,822 lbs. weight. By the year 1895 the trade had increased, so that we shipped 25,986,000 lbs. weight.

Chairman—continued.

3626. Do you export bacon?—Not to this country; we do a trade with the East and with South Africa.

3627. Is that marked?—No.

3628. I understand you to say the marking will gradually come about?—I am sure about it; it is a matter which is being dealt with by various Parliaments.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3629. Are you against this Bill or in favour of it?—We are against it in so far as the designation of our products as "foreign" is concerned, but only in that.

3630. If your products were designated as British you would be in favour of it, would you?—Yes, we are quite prepared to hold our own with any country in the world as far as that goes.

3631. You would not mind, would you, marking all your goods "Victorian," or "Australian"?—No; we want to do that.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3632. If all the meat exported from the Australian colonies is inspected, there would not be much difficulty in marking it, would there, if a law was passed here that it should arrive here marked?—No, the only difficulty would be after the meat is cut up here.

3633. That is a different question; but as far as the meat arriving in this country is concerned, there would be no difficulty in marking it before it left the Australian port, would there?—Not at all; in fact, at present all the Victorian meat is marked. After inspection by the Government inspectors there it receives the stamp of the Department of Agriculture on the wrappers.

3634. Not on the meat itself?—Not on the meat itself.

3635. Is there any case in the Australian colonies where the meat itself is marked?—No.

3636. But only the wrappers?—That is all.

Chairman.

3637. Does the Bill which you spoke of propose marking on the meat?—No, not that I am aware of; the Bill is to provide for making it compulsory that all agricultural products, such as meat, butter, cheese, and so on, shall receive Government inspection prior to shipment.

3638. It would satisfy the Bill, so far as you know it, if the wrapper or box, or whatever it is in, is marked?—Yes. I may say with regard to Victoria that all these products are inspected on arrival here, to see that the conditions are carried out and the product goes in a good condition to the British consumers. I inspect myself all the meat steamers arriving here.

3639. Do you live here?—Yes, I live here at present.

3640. Is it your office to receive the meat and see that it is in good condition?—Yes, and protect the interests of our people on the other side in every way.

3641. Are you appointed by the Government?—I am appointed by the Government. The

Chairman—continued.

Government, three years ago, sent me all round the world to see how things were carried out in other countries. I visited North America, and spent six months there. I also visited the Argentine Republic.

3642. Do you act under the Agents General?—No, I am appointed by the Victorian Government. There were some statements made in the House of Commons in regard to our meat from Australia, that it was liable to cause disease, and quite a number of reflections were made upon it.

3643. For what reason; because it was itself diseased?—I do not know the reason of it, but a statement was made, and it was published in the Australian papers. The people are quite indignant about it, and I should like to answer any questions with regard to that.

3644. Was that some time ago?—It was in connection with this Bill, and the various Governments have asked me to place these stock reports in evidence in refutation of the statement referred to.

3645. Generally, do you deny any such thing?—Distinctly so, because we have a system of stock inspection in the colony as to which there is no equal in this country. We have also inspectors of private slaughter-yards, and duly qualified veterinary surgeons inspect all the carcases prior to shipment.

3646. Would you say in answer to any allegation, first, that you have inspection of the stock first of all throughout the country?—Yes.

3647. Then you have inspection of the slaughter-houses?—Yes.

3648. Then you have inspection before the meat is sent off, have you?—Yes.

3649. And then you yourself are here in London?—Yes.

3650. Have you any other agents at any other ports?—No.

3651. Does it all come into London?—Very small shipments go to Manchester and Glasgow.

3652. The main shipments are here, and you inspect them on their arrival, do you not?—Yes.

3653 So that with that inspection do you consider that every safeguard has been taken to prevent any diseased or imperfect meat coming into this country?—Yes.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3654. Are you prepared to bring a scientific man here to say that frozen meat is as good as fresh meat?—There was an investigation made, in fact a series of experiments were conducted by Dr. Rideal here in regard to the supply of meat for the hospitals.

3655. Did he report in favour of supplying frozen meat to the hospitals?—Yes.

3656. Do you know, as a matter of fact, if the London hospitals are supplied with frozen meat in preference to fresh meat?—I cannot say that.

Chairman.

3657. Can you read, so as to get it on the notes, any short statement of Dr. Rideal's opinion?—Yes. The first test was carried out in regard to the use of frozen meat as an economy. There was a test made between English grown and killed meat and the

Chairman—continued.

best Canterbury frozen mutton. Then there was a test as to the digestibility of frozen meat and the action of freezing. Dr. Rideal says: "An effort was made in the following experiments to procure meat of the same description, but it was impossible to balance with any accuracy the exact condition of the animals. The three kinds of mutton selected for comparison were London-killed Scotch at 10*d.* per lb.; frozen Canterbury at 8*d.* per lb.; and frozen Australian from the merino sheep at 4*d.* per lb. Under the directions of Dr. Rideal, who conducted the experiments, all the lean meat, exclusive of skin, tendons, &c., was removed from a leg of each of the above kinds of mutton, and was then passed uncooked through a mincing machine. Samples of these meats were then submitted by him to artificial digestion experiments, with the view of determining whether the effect of freezing is to hinder or retard the digestibility of meat." The result of the experiments is then given. He stated: "The freezing of the foreign meat seems to have slightly reduced the amount of water present in the minced meat, so that the foreign meat, weight for weight, has a greater amount of food constituents if the fat be taken into account. Little comment is necessary on the above results. The difference between the English and foreign meat is so slight as again to suggest the probability that had all the samples been English or all foreign, taken from different animals, the results could hardly have worked out more evenly."

3658. Is there anything about disease in that report?—No. But in this extract from the "British Medical Journal" of the 29th May in reference to Australian meat it is stated: "Meat properly frozen cannot suffer any deterioration. No rupturing of the cells occur in properly frozen meat; all the properties of fresh meat are retained in frozen meat. Neither the proteids nor the albumenoids nor the fats are chemically affected by cold, consequently there is no impairment of the nutritious properties when thawed." In regard to disease, I have all the statistics and reports of the inspectors up to date.

3659. Do you consider, at any rate with regard to Victoria, that Victoria is especially free from disease?—Yes, also all the Australian colonies.

3660. As to the mutton, and beef probably, is not some knowledge required as to how to treat it when it is going to be cooked?—Simply as to the gradual thawing of it.

3661. Are there not some other precautions necessary. Are not certain precautions suggested in dealing with mutton, such as hanging it the wrong way up?—Yes, that I cannot speak about.

3662. Do you know that there are certain ways of treating it which, if they are not attended to, might make it inferior for eating?—If it is thawed too rapidly I know that it is not so good then; it requires a gradual thawing.

3663. Dr. Rideal does not deal in his report with the question of disease, does he?—No, he does not; but we think it very hard that such a statement should have been made unless it could be substantiated in any way.

Mr. HENRY CHARLES CAMERON, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3664. HAVE you been for years connected with the meat and dairying industries in New Zealand?—Yes.

3665. May I ask in what capacity?—I have been dealing in stock, in New Zealand farming, and buying stock for the refrigerating companies in New Zealand; and since the initiation of the dairy factory system in New Zealand I was one of the promoters of the Inchclutha Dairy Factory Company; I was secretary of that company, and also of the Stirling Dairy Factory Company.

3666. Have you any official position?—I hold the position of Inspector of Produce for the New Zealand Government.

3667. Do you hold the same position as Mr. Sinclair does for Victoria?—Yes.

3668. Do you inspect all the produce which is received here?—Yes.

3669. Will you tell the Committee generally what comes from New Zealand; does frozen meat come from New Zealand?—Frozen mutton and frozen lamb, but very little frozen beef; butter, cheese, and rabbits, and a few sundries are also sent, such as kidneys, and also tinned meats.

3670. Have you any system of marking in New Zealand?—Yes.

3671. When the goods are exported or when they get here?—When exported. We do not mark them here. I have merely to inspect the produce on this side.

3672. Do they come marked?—Yes.

3673. On the wrappers or the boxes?—The sheep and lambs are wrapped in bags with the brand of the factory they are frozen at on them, and with the brand of the factory on a tag, as it is called, tied to the shank. The butter boxes are branded with the name of the factory, the description of the butter, and also the grade that the Government has passed it at in New Zealand. The cheese is branded on the case with the factory brand and the quality of the cheese; also it is branded on the cheese itself, that is to say, on the wrapper that encloses the cheese, with the brand "New Zealand factory—full cream cheese," and the number representing the factory from which the cheese comes. If the cheese is half-cream cheese it has to be marked with a description of the cheese.

3674. What do you call "half-cream cheese?"—That is, with a percentage of the cream taken out. The New Zealand Dairying Industry Act is very particular, and prohibits the adulteration of either cheese or butter; it prohibits filled cheese, as it is called, being made.

3675. Are the markings compulsory by law?—They are compulsory by law.

3676. Is that so of the markings which you have described?—Yes. In New Zealand the principal make of butter is what is called factory butter, when all the farmers in the district take their milk to, and the butter is made at a common centre. The butter then is termed "factory butter," and is branded so. If butter is taken from several farmers and mixed, that is, milled at a factory, it has not only to be branded with a different wording stating what quality it is, but also the printing has to be done in red lettering,

Chairman—continued.

so that it will be noticeable. Every precaution that can be taken to describe thoroughly the quality and condition of the dairy produce in New Zealand is taken.

3677. Are there inspectors going about to see that the law is carried into effect?—Numerous inspectors; and at each port of shipment there is what is called a grader, whose duty it is to inspect the produce as it goes aboard the steamer to see that it is in perfect condition and branded with a grade—a Government brand, first, second, or third, which is distinctly printed on the box.

3678. He does not inspect every box, does he?—No, he takes samples from each lot. The inspection of the mutton is also conducted somewhat similarly at the freezing works. When the sheep are taken there they are put in paddocks, as they are called, where they are kept until they are thoroughly cooled and ready for killing. They are carefully slaughtered and dressed; then they are graded, that is to say, that anything of inferior quality and not in proper condition is rejected and only the very best is sent. After that they are cooled and frozen.

3679. How does New Zealand mutton stand in price in this country compared with Australian mutton?—It stands higher than Australian mutton. The New Zealand producers have made a study of the frozen meat industry since the year 1881, when the first shipment came. They have paid special attention to breeding sheep purposely for the meat market in this country; the principal flocks are bred from the Down and the Leicester cross, which are considered the best mutton sheep. New Zealand is a country with a climate very like that of England, and farming is conducted in almost a similar manner to that carried on in England and Scotland. The sheep are fattened on English grasses, as they are in this country; they are fed in the winter time on turnips and chaff and oats. Every care is taken both in breeding and feeding, and every precaution is taken that only the finest quality of mutton is sent home here.

3680. How does the price here of New Zealand mutton compare with English?—It is a long way below the English price.

3681. Has it been rising of late years at all?—No, it has not been rising of late years; it has been decreasing, if anything, in the wholesale market price.

3682. Do you know whether it has been increasing or decreasing relatively to English. When you say it has been decreasing, English and other meat may have been increasing, and I want to know whether, relatively, it has been increasing?—There is a strong piece of evidence which can be given against the argument that the importation of New Zealand mutton hurts the English farmer. Although New Zealand mutton is largely consumed in this country and has been fetching lately a lower price than formerly in the wholesale market, yet English mutton has gone up in price; so that New Zealand mutton does not, apparently, hurt the sale of the English farmer's production.

3683. From the prices which you get now is it a thoroughly

Chairman—continued.

a thoroughly profitable industry?—The New Zealand producer complains, and I do not think it is at a sufficiently profitable price.

3684. Still, it is sufficiently profitable for him to go on with it, is it?—He is always expecting a better price.

3685. Has the quantity exported been increasing very largely?—Yes, it has increased largely the last number of years, though it is now steady; it is not increasing now as rapidly as it was a few years ago.

3686. Would you say that it had been stationary during the last four or five years?—Slightly increasing.

3687. Is the quantity very large. Will you give the Committee the quantity exported last year?—The imports of New Zealand mutton and lamb since the beginning of this year have been 1,647,611, or about that number.

3688. If I were to double that would it be a fair representation of the number during the year?—Scarcely.

3689. How much would you add for the remainder of the year?—Possibly only half; the reason being that the beginning of the year is the time when sheep arrive from New Zealand in largest numbers, and lambs also arrive here during that time.

3690. If I called the total for the year 2,500,000 I should be about right, probably?—Roughly speaking, it is about that.

3691. That is a larger figure, is it not, than we got from the Australian evidence?—Yes, New Zealand is the largest mutton producing country in the world.

3692. Do you send any beef?—Very little. New Zealand, as I say, is a country very similar to England and Scotland, but almost entirely depends upon sheep-farming and dairying; wool, mutton, and dairy produce.

3693. Have you a system of inspection of stock there?—Yes, a very complete system.

3694. Is your freedom from disease complete?—Yes.

3695. The Agent General thought that New Zealand had been rather condemned unduly by an allegation that the frozen meat produced disease in this country. Have you anything to say as to that?—I understand that Mr. Wingfield-Digby stated in the House that the consumption of frozen meat led to cancer and other terrible diseases. I do not think there is any evidence to prove that; in fact, New Zealand is a country where there is no disease among the flocks whatever; it is, in fact, a most healthy country. As I say, the stock there is fed as they are in this country, on English grass, and turnips with chaff.

3696. Have you ever had any periods of disease in New Zealand since 1880?—None, neither disease nor drought.

3697. Do your inspectors condemn animals occasionally for disease?—If they find any animal which they think has tuberculosis, or anything of the sort, they are empowered to seize it and kill it.

3698. Then there is such a thing as tuberculosis in New Zealand?—There may be an odd case, but there is no disease common to New Zealand.

Chairman—continued.

3699. It would be a special case of a special animal, you say?—Certainly.

3700. There is nothing like an epidemic, and there never has been?—There never has been.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3701. Is there any special liability to cancer among the human race in New Zealand?—Not more so than in this country; I have heard of a case or two in New Zealand; but probably the seeds of the cancer disease have been in these parties before they left England, when they emigrated.

Chairman.

3702. You are prepared to give evidence, I think, of New Zealand frozen meat being sold for British?—Yes.

3703. You cannot give names, but you can give experience?—Yes, for the last two and a-half years I have conducted the New Zealand Produce Stores in Manchester.

3704. Are these stores you speak of marked "New Zealand Stores"?—Certainly, openly.

3705. And you only sell there, do you, New Zealand produce?—That is so.

3706. And you make a feature of it because you think it is advantageous to the trade, do you?—I make a feature of it in order to introduce it, and as an advertisement for New Zealand produce.

3707. Are the New Zealand stores a retail establishment?—Yes, it is a retail establishment in Manchester, close to the London Road Station. There I sell all the produce advertised in that shop in the manner that is desired by the Bill before the Committee. I advertise it as "New Zealand," and it is all marked as what it is in the shop, and people coming there know that they are getting New Zealand produce. From my experience as a retailer I may say that there is no harassing whatever by doing what this Bill requires. I am going now to talk principally of the foreign meat which it is intended shall be included as British. I think myself that the evidence which has been given by large English butchers against this clause is because they are interested, in that it is to their interest that foreign meat should be retailed by them without any announcement, because a great prejudice exists against foreign meat. If these retailers have to announce openly that they are dealing in foreign meat they are afraid this prejudice is so strong that many of their customers will object, if they keep foreign meat. I see no reason whatever why the term "foreign" should not include the flesh of all animals from abroad, whether alive or dead; it is foreign meat.

3708. You object, do you not, to New Zealand meat being marked foreign meat?—I certainly hold this: that colonial meat should be called "colonial meat," and "foreign meat," as distinguishing meat from other countries, that is, countries not connected with Great Britain.

3709. Then you do not press for colonial meat being called British; you would be quite satisfied if it was called colonial meat, would you?—Yes.

3710. So that you would have three designations: British meat, colonial meat, and foreign meat?—

Chairman – continued.

meat?—Yes; but I would even go further and say with Professor Robinson, let each colony stand for itself, and announce New Zealand meat, Australian meat, and Canadian meat; and all that comes from anywhere else as foreign meat.

3711. You do not find any prejudice, do you, in your New Zealand stores?—Yes, a strong prejudice.

3712. Still, you have a sale?—Yes.

3713. Is it an increasing sale?—Yes, it is an increasing sale.

3714. I suppose your purchasers are mostly the working classes?—No, the opposite. I have made a special effort to introduce it to the better classes; and I do not, as the butcher from Leeds to-day said, sell it in rough shops, but I sell it in an attractive manner in as good and well-fitted a shop as any English butcher has. I give special attention to that and show it as an advertisement.

3715. But you would be glad to get a sale among working classes, I apprehend?—Yes, but then I come into competition with inferior meat; at present I only supply the very finest, which the working classes are not willing to pay for; they prefer quantity to quality.

3716. Your price is lower than that of the British meat, is it not?—Yes.

3717. But it is rather higher than what you would call inferior meat at butchers' shops?—Yes.

3718. And you find, do you, that the working classes will not pay the extra price to you, and that they have rather a prejudice against it, being New Zealand meat; is that so?—Yes, there is a strong prejudice against foreign or colonial meat at present. I therefore think that if this Bill passes, as I hope it will, it will be advantageous to the British farmer; for this reason, that at present there is a great deal of foreign meat, especially beef, that is brought here and killed here, sold by English butchers to customers, who, if they saw an announcement that they were getting it, would be prejudiced, and would not be inclined to have it, and therefore the British farmer would have a better chance. He would have an opportunity then of putting more spirit into his work, and of improving his breeds, and have a better chance altogether in the rearing of his stock, and of getting a better price for it.

3719. With regard to the quality of the imported beef, do you say that the American chilled beef is a good deal superior to the meat of the animals killed at Deptford and Birkenhead?—Yes; and for this reason: that the animals which come across in the steamer to Deptford and Birkenhead are heated, and naturally are knocked about on the voyage. They are killed after they are supposed to have cooled down here, but the flesh of those animals is not so good as the beef that is brought here chilled. The beef that is chilled in America is the finest States beef; it is killed and put merely in a cool temperature, where it is hung, and is brought across here without heating or bruising in any manner whatever. It is then put on the market: it is tender and juicy and good beef; and altogether I know that it goes largely into consumption and is now used as English beef.

Chairman—continued.

3720. Then you would no doubt be in favour of including in the Bill that beef which is killed at Deptford and Birkenhead?—I cannot think what the object has been of introducing the clause. I think if any beef is, that foreign beef which comes from America should be included.

3721. You have given a good deal of attention since you have been in this country to the conditions under which the retail trade here is carried on, have you not?—I have.

3722. Do you think that this Bill, if passed into law, would be harassing and inconvenient to the straightforward retail dealer?—I do not in the slightest degree. I have done what is required by this Bill for two and a half years, and I shall continue to do it whether the Bill is passed or not. There is no harassing at all.

3723. Do you mark all your products?—Yes.

3724. How do you mark them?—In the first place, I have large signs above my shop door announcing that I am selling New Zealand produce; in the second place, all the meat that goes into my shop is hung up with the tags attached to it, so that anyone going in can see what they are getting. I have also advertisements announcing that I am selling New Zealand meat; and if I have American beef, I have also a notice announcing that it is American beef: I also send circulars out announcing it.

3725. How are the carcases from New Zealand marked when they arrive in this country?—They have no marks on them; the marks are on tags, and the tags are attached to the leg, but they can be removed. Generally these tags are detached by the butchers. The chilled beef comes across from America with a tag attached to it, which can be taken off and the meat hung in the shop without any mark whatever. That is done, and generally done.

3726. Have you any experience of marking the actual meat itself with a stamp or a stencil?—I have seen New Zealand lambs come across with a brand on the leg made with indelible ink. At present, on board the "Mamari," a vessel just arrived, there are 12 carcases sent from New Zealand bearing a brand which it is intended shall be patented, namely, branding by puncture; it is a puncture made when the animal is hot; any person can see it. I think the Bill only requires now that the large portions of meat shall be branded; it does not require that every chop and every steak shall be branded; I think that is only right, because it would be impossible; but the fact remains, that if a customer goes into a shop and sees legs of mutton, shoulders of mutton, saddles of mutton, and the steak pieces and sirloins and ribs of beef branded, he will be perfectly satisfied that the small portions are from these carcases.

3727. Therefore, do you think that the marking of the legs and other portions, say, with five or six marks on each carcase, would be a protection to the consumer?—Quite, and he will naturally conclude that the chops or steaks are from these carcases.

3728. You object to the New Zealand mutton being marked with the word "Foreign." If the words "New Zealand" were marked they would be allowed to pass; but if there was no mark of

Chairman—continued.

origin they should be marked "Foreign," should they not? You would have no objection to that, would you?—No; I am in favour of having the produce marked "New Zealand produce," "Canadian produce," "Australian produce," or "Foreign produce."

3729. It might easily be arranged, might it not, that the name of any colony should be allowed to pass?—Yes.

3730. But if it were not stamped with any place of origin it would have to be marked "Foreign," would it not?—Yes; I strongly believe in those who deal in colonial or foreign meat being registered, because if a person is dealing in an article he need not be ashamed to announce that he is doing so. If he intends to deal honestly, there is no reason why he should not announce it; and it is a safeguard to the consumer. It is not lowering the tone of a man's business. If a man chooses to deal in a produce and do it surreptitiously, so that no one knows, then I say that he ought to be compelled to mark his goods. I know, and I think it is generally understood, that the large quantity of beef and mutton that comes into this country is not generally sold in shops that announce it. Then where does it go to?

3731. It has been suggested by one or two of the previous witnesses that if this clause requiring the registration of butchers were enacted, practically all butchers would have to register, because they all deal more or less in foreign meat at different times of the year. Do you think that is the case?—So much the better. All the difference that that would make would be that people would know what they were selling.

3732. I suppose you know the trade in Manchester pretty well?—Yes.

3733. Do you think in Manchester there are any butchers who never have any foreign meat in their shops?—There may be one or two, I would not say there are not; but if there are this Bill would be in their favour, because they would not require to register, and probably customers would come to them in larger numbers, and they would be able to get a better price for the English article, seeing that those butchers who use American beef could not afford to cut the prices against them.

3734. You think there are not many in Manchester, do you?—I should not like to say, of course.

3735. Do any of the butchers, to your knowledge, advertise that they only sell British meat?—No, I do not know of any who advertise they only sell British meat; there are those who advertise that they sell colonial meat, but they are principally companies interested in colonial meat, and of course the inference to the consumer when no announcement is made by a good butcher as to the quality of meat he sells is that it is British meat that is being sold. I heard a witness say to-day that if a person asked what beef it was he was buying he would be told; but it is very seldom any one asks; they go into a shop under the assumption that it is English, and the butcher does not say that it is or that it is not.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3736. Can we detect disease in the frozen carcase when it comes over to this country; I have heard you say you have plenty of inspectors on the other side of the water who take good care that no diseased animals are shipped?—Yes.

3737. You have a certain amount of disease, I suppose?—I have never heard of any, except an odd case.

Chairman.

3738. No epidemic?—None whatever; New Zealand is the healthiest country in the world.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3739. Can any one detect when the carcase has been frozen some time, if there had been disease, even if it had gone?—I cannot tell you that; but I know that if there is a bruise in the animal, or even if it is a ewe which has been killed and there is a slight taint of milk about her, you can detect it here.

3740. Would the inspectors allow them to be shipped?—No; but I say if such a thing did occur you could tell that here.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3741. I suppose the inspector likewise would object to passing a thin or an accidentally maimed animal?—When sheep come down country to the refrigerating works where they are slaughtered they are all put through a race. The expert manager handles every sheep, and rejects any that are not up to the standard. Then after they are killed they are all passed through a grading room, and if anything is found after slaughtering not in perfect condition, or any fault whatever, it is rejected.

3742. The inspector is not there specially for the purpose of detecting disease of an epidemic character, but generally to inspect the carcases?—No; because a deceased animal would not be sent down.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3743. You are in favour of the Bill, are you not; and, in fact, you are in favour of selling foreign and colonial produce as such?—Yes.

3744. In fact, you are in favour of generally selling all things as what they are?—I merely ask for fair trade. The British farmer says that he is quite prepared to let colonial produce be sold on its merits, and I say the same. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the British farmer doing so. I know there is a cry raised by those opposing the Bill that the colonials want it, because it will benefit them; but I think it will benefit the British farmer. It may benefit the colonists, but that has to be proved; and we stand to the merits of our article.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3745. You understand that this Bill classes you as a foreigner, do you not?—Yes.

3746. Would you be satisfied to be left in that position?—No.

3747. Then this Bill will not do for you, will it?—Yes; but I object to this 15th Clause, for instance.

Chairman.

3748. You are in favour of the principle of marking?— Yes.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3749. You said that an inspection of smaller quantities of meat was impossible, did you not? —I think if the larger joints were marked it would be sufficient.

3750. How would that protect the small purchasers in the retail markets; would they have any guarantee at all?—Yes, to this extent; that if they go into a shop they see legs, shoulders, saddles, the principal joints, branded as colonial or foreign, and the presumption is that the small pieces are cut off those carcases.

3751. The presumption would not work, because he might presume it would be all English, and the small bits might be foreign. The butcher might have both kinds in the shop at once, might he not?—But he would have the large joints.

3752. The presumed danger is that the butcher would sell foreign meat instead of English meat without saying it was foreign. He has English meat in his shop, has he not?—All he could sell would be the small cuts. He has to use the large quarters which the smaller pieces are in.

3753. I am thinking of a set of circumstances which are not perhaps in your mind; I am thinking of the large retail markets in manufacturing towns, where the meat is always sold in small bits, chopped up in all sorts of sizes, where you do not see a large joint at all?—If what I propose is not sufficient, it might be possible to put a clause in the Bill, that although not branded it could be labelled the same as butter now is labelled. But I think that is a very simple matter.

3754. Do you think the English article would get a higher price if you had this marking, so as to protect it from competition with the foreign article?—Yes.

3755. And do you think that that would be distinctly to the advantage of the English farmer, and would raise the price of meat?—It would raise the price of meat in this way: At present foreign beef is sold in some English shops at the same price as English beef is sold. Now, if it was marked "foreign," they would probably have to reduce the price of that foreign beef and retain the price of the English beef.

3756. You think it would be an advantage to the farmer and raise the price of his meat at the cost of the public, do you?—Those consumers who are desirous of obtaining English meat through prejudice are willing to pay a better price for it. I know from my own experience that many people I have approached would rather pay 3*d.* or 4*d.* a pound more for English than they would give for my meat; and they are ready to do it.

3757. You are quite of opinion, are you, that the effect of this Bill would be to raise the price of English meat?—I would not say that it would, retail.

3758. I think you have said so, have you not? —I say that it would to a certain extent. I

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

believe it would for English beef, but to a very slight extent. I think the tendency would be rather in favour of lowering the foreign prices, because this live imported meat is sold now at English prices, and the butcher being able to mix that in a good class trade can sell it at an English price, and consequently can compete with any butcher who sells only English. The price they give for live American cattle being considerably below the price given for English of the same quality.

3759. Do you agree with what has been stated, that the meat imported from America is quite as good, or nearly as good, as our English beef?— Yes, I consider that the chilled American beef is quite as good as the average English beef. I think the English farmer, if this Bill passes, would have more heart in his farming altogether; and, though that is a slight encouragement to him, I think the country would be benefited by it.

3760. Do you think we should prevent this good beef coming from America, for the advantage of the consumer, here, and to raise the price of such beef as we have in England, which, as you say, is not the best quality for the consumption of the public?—I say that the inducement to the farmer then would be to improve the quality of that beef.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3761. You assented to Mr. Brigg's statement that it would be at the expense of the British public. The British public would not be obliged to pay unless they liked, would they?—I say I believe there are a large number of the British public who are willing to pay a little more for British beef. There is a company lately started in London, Lord Winchelsea's company, with the object of selling only British meat, and they ask and get a better price for it.

3762. Do you really think, on reflection, that this Bill would impose any undue burden on the general body of consumers?—No, I said it might to a very slight degree, but not unduly.

3763. It might increase the demand for British meat, might it not?—I think so.

3764. But the only people who would insist on having English meat would be those who would be able to pay for it?—I say it may be so to a slight extent, but I think, on the other hand, as I said, the chances are that the foreign meat would be reduced in price; consequently if there was a slight rise in one there would be a slight depreciation in the other, which would benefit the public.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3765. Then if you say that it would reduce the price of the meat which is coming from abroad in that way, would not the effect of that be to prevent that meat coming from abroad; would not it limit the quantity coming, because there would not be such a price to be obtained? —I do not think so; in my evidence about New Zealand mutton I stated that the price had fallen for the last year or two, and yet an increase has been going on.

3766. You think if you reduce the price of foreign meat, it would still encourage their

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

sending it here; do you?—I think they would continue to send it here; I do not see that there would be a heavy drop in the price.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3767. At any rate you think, do you not, that the great mass of consumers, the working classes in our manufacturing districts, will always have plenty of cheap meat?—I do not think it would make a bit of difference to them.

3768. Therefore it will not make the food of the people dearer or anything of the sort, will it?—I do not think it will make any difference whatever, taking the average all through.

3769. If a man wishes to get a leg of mutton at say 4*d.* a pound, he will always be able to get one, you think?—Yes. He knows he can get it now; but in many shops he does not know that he is getting it when he is, and he may pay more for it. I say, therefore, it is no hardship for anyone who wishes to deal honestly with the public, if this Bill passes.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3770. Except with the amendment you suggest?—Certainly. I would like to know the argument which was put forward when Clause 15 was introduced. I have not heard what the idea is in having it in at all.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

3771. But you are in favour, as you have said before, of the principle of marking?—Certainly; and putting up a bold announcement that a person is registered for the sale of colonial or foreign meat. I should like to say that I know that a great deal of cheese is sold in the same manner as this foreign meat is, without any distinguishing mark. I say that it should be branded, not so much on the cheese itself actually as labelled "New Zealand Cheese" or "Canadian Cheese," in the same manner that margarine has a label now. Butter, I also say, should be marked with the source of origin. I have here butter sent from New Zealand; it has the name of the factory and "New Zealand" on it. That butter, everyone knows, is "New Zealand." Supposing it is sold wholesale in the English market, the retailer takes this paper off and sells it as English at 2*d.* a pound above the price I sell it at.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3772. How would you mark that?—I would have it marked in the same way as margarine is marked, by label, and when sold having it put in a wrapper bearing the name of the country of origin. I would have cheese dealt with in the same manner.

Wednesday, 28th July 1897.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mr. Brigg.
Colonel Cotton-Jodrell.
Mr. Wingfield-Digby.
Mr. Doughty.
Sir William Houldsworth.
Mr. Heywood Johnstone.
Mr. Kilbride.
Sir Elliott Lees.
Mr. MacAleese.
Mr. Mildmay.
Mr. A. H. Smith.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH, BART., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. MICHAEL BYRNE, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

3773. YOU are, I think, a butcher at Birkenhead?—Yes; I am also a member of the Town Council of Birkenhead.

3774. You have considerable experience and knowledge of the system of importing live cattle and slaughtering it at that port?—Yes, I have been 16 years in business on my own account, and practically all my life in the trade, I was brought up to the trade by my father.

3775. Do you approve of this Bill?—No.

3776. Do you approve of its object in marking foreign meat; I am speaking generally first, I will come to the distinct clauses afterwards?—I do not approve of it at all.

3777. You do not approve of the marking of frozen meat?—I am not in that line.

3778. But you do not approve of it on general grounds?—I do not approve of it. I think it is unnecessary, because frozen meat is actually marked itself at the present time.

3779. You approve of one part of the Bill, I suppose, namely, Clause 15, which provides that "the words 'British or Irish meat' mean meat killed within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Channel Islands, or the Isle of Man"?—Yes. If you do not retain that clause, I think your Bill would be worthless, because it would create such a lot of litigation as to our English-killed meat, that butchers would never really be out of trouble. In fact, I might go further, and ask, why should butchers be singled out as against other people who are dealing with foreign products.

3780. Do you sell both wholesale and retail?—Yes, both wholesale and retail.

3781. Do you sell English-grown meat?—Yes, but the majority of meat is Birkenhead-killed. The reason of that is the arbitrary manner of the meat inspection at Birkenhead against English meat, because in Birkenhead we have such good facilities for getting the best meat at our lairages.

3782. Do you consider that the Birkenhead-killed meat is as good as any English-grown meat?—Yes, if we get the best.

3783. You think that the best Birkenhead-killed meat is as good as the best English?—Yes.

3784. Is the average as good?—There is a new trade which has sprung up within the last two years. The American beef is as good, in fact, it is above the average of English meat; the class is a better class.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3785. Do you mean chilled beef?—No, I mean American English-killed beef.

Chairman.

3786. Would you say that the average of what is killed at Birkenhead would be worse than the average of English-grown meat?—I reckon even the worst of South American beef is equal to a lot of the cows that are killed in different portions of this country.

3787. You say you consider that the average is quite as good as English-grown meat?—Yes.

3788. And in some cases this American beef is better?—I prefer it; and I say so because we have no complaints from our customers, they like it. It is very seldom we are asked what it is; if we were asked we tell them, they never complain of it.

3789. Do you sell the Birkenhead-killed meat cheaper than the other; does it bring a less price?—We sell it all on the level, both in one shop.

3790. That is to say, you put your price according to the quality to some extent, both as regards the English-grown meat and the Birkenhead-killed?—As I said before, I reckon the American beef in England equally as good as the English beef.

3791. I suppose you have different prices for different qualities of meat?—I always buy the best article I can for money.

3792. You take care to sell one quality of meat?—Yes.

3793. Whether it is home-grown or whether it is Birkenhead-killed you put the same price on it and get the same price?—Quite so.

3794. But you take care that the quality for both is up to what you consider a good standard?—Yes.

3795. It suits your customers?—Yes; in fact it

Chairman—continued.

it is very hard to tell the difference. I do not care what experience a butcher or a farmer has, if some English cattle and some American cattle are killed altogether in the same place, I think it would be utterly impossible to pick out the American from the English.

3796. How do you sell your wholesale meat; in selling wholesale have you a different establishment from the retail?—No.

3797. What does selling "wholesale" mean with you; does it mean selling whole carcases?—Sometimes whole carcases and some times half carcases.

3798. Those are sold to smaller butchers, I presume?—Yes.

3799. In Cheshire?—In Birkenhead and the district.

3800. You do not sell to butchers at a distance?—No.

Mr. *Brigg.*

3801. I should like to ask you upon one matter as to which you seem to take a different view from that of the other witnesses who have been before us. You spoke about Birkenhead-killed beef being quite as good or better than English; have you considered the difference between American-killed and brought over chilled as compared with that brought over alive and killed in England?—I am not in that trade; I never sold any chilled beef in my life; I have never been in that trade, so that it is no use my speaking as to that.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

3802. Why do you imagine there would be such a great amount of litigation if these words you refer to in Clause 15 were not retained?—I maintain this: Supposing you pick two of the most likely butchers in London, men who understand their trade, and you get 20 miles out of London five American cattle and five English cattle killed together, and place them in a particular shop, it would be very hard to tell which of those was American and which was English. That is where I say litigation would come in.

3803. You do not agree with the conclusion which several witnesses have come to, that after a long journey the imported live American, killed at the port of debarkation, cannot compare with the best British meat in point of quality?—I can safely say that so far as American cattle are concerned, I have never seen American cattle black in the flesh, and I have seen Irish and English cattle so.

3804. I am speaking of the best?—I was speaking of the best too; the cattle I was referring to had travelled by foot, and the American had had eight or 12 days' rest on the ship.

3805. In that case it would not be the best quality of English?—Yes; but through their walking a certain distance to market it would make the flesh black, and they would want a certain amount of resting.

3806. That would be rather an abnormal case. Taking them as a whole, is it not the fact that after the long journey from America, even with a tolerably good voyage, the consequences of the long journey are that, as regards the cattle

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

coming from a distance, the meat cannot compare in point of quality with British meat?—No.

3807. You do not agree with Mr. Cooper and the other witnesses?—Mr. Cooper may have his own opinion. I maintain that Birkenhead-killed beef is equal to any beef you can get anywhere. I maintain that Mr. Cooper or any other witness cannot tell, if the carcase is cut up into pieces and placed in a butcher's shop, which is English and which is American beef killed in England; he might be able to do so in some instances, but very rarely.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3808. Under this Bill, supposing it becomes law, I take it that the marking would be carried out and impressed upon the side of the animal at, we will say, your lairage at Birkenhead?—Do you mean after the bullock has been killed?

3809. Yes?—Do you mean on the carcase?

3810. Yes?—What benefit would that be to the purchaser or the man who is retailing it?

3811. It would prevent the litigation you spoke of, would it not?—You could not retain the mark when you cut up the animal. You would have perhaps 300 or 400 little pieces if the man is in the retail trade.

3812. Who are your customers?—The public.

3813. Direct?—Yes; it is not all direct; we send for orders.

3814. What I am speaking of now is in connection with the lairage; you sell there wholesale, do you not?—No, I do not sell any at the lairage; I buy in the lairage and bring the meat to my establishment, and I have country butchers who come from Cheshire to buy from me.

3815. I was under a misunderstanding; I thought you were giving evidence as a person who was connected, as an official, with the lairage?—No, I am a retail trader. I maintain that it would be unbusinesslike to try to mark every piece of meat.

3816. Do you buy the cattle alive?—Very often.

3817. At Birkenhead?—Yes.

3818. Do you slaughter them yourself?—We buy them, and they slaughter them for us.

3819. You buy the dead meat?—Practically I go in and pick out the bullocks alive, and they slaughter them for me.

3820. I think you said that you have never bought anything but the very best quality. You mean by that, I suppose, principally from the States?—That is so.

3821. Have you any experience of cattle landed from the River Plate?—I have seen them landing. I have been in South America, and seen the cattle there, and I have seen the Australian cattle; I have been in Australia.

3822. Have you bought any?—I have bought cattle in Australia.

3823. I mean as a butcher in Birkenhead, do you buy South American meat?—No.

3824. You do not consider that that is up to the same standard as the Canadian and States beef?—It would not suit my trade.

3825. Why; is it because it is not good enough?—The quality is not good enough. The same amount of litigation might arise even with

that

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

that meat as with the other if Clause 15 were not there.

3826. Then with regard to price; you say you put the same price on both the English and the foreign to your retail customers?—Yes.

3827. The English costs you more than the foreign, does it not?—Taking it on the average, I think during this year the English meat has been perhaps a halfpenny a pound dearer than American beef has been, but still there is less bone, and I do not think there is much difference between them.

3828. You think the difference is not more than a halfpenny?—No; I do not agree with the evidence given by Mr. Davies as to that point.

3829. I was just going to refer to that; he says that the difference is more than that?—He says 1*d.* to 2*d.* a lb.; in his evidence, may I ask, did he say whether that was frozen meat or American killed in England?

3830. American killed in England, I understood it to be; at Question 1101 the Chairman asked: "I would rather take the lairages at Birkenhead; what difference is there between it and the home-killed and home-grown meat," and the answer is: "The one he will get at 6*d.* or 7*d.*, and the other at the lairage he will pay only the market value for." "What is that?" asks the Chairman, and the reply is: "I think to-day it is 4*d.* or 5*d.*" Then the Chairman asks: "He buys it a 1*d.* or 2*d.* cheaper?" and the answer is: "Yes." You do not agree with that?—I do not agree with his evidence when he says that there is a difference of a 1*d.* or 2*d.* a lb.

3831. You do not think it is so much?—No; I think it is very nearly equal, and it has been all the year. You must bear in mind that Birkenhead is the dearest American meat market in England this year.

3832. You said the difference was a halfpenny?—Yes, I have thought it out with other members of the trade, and that is the conclusion we have come to, ½*d.* to ¾*d*; practically a ½*d.* At Christmas time, when the Hundred of Wirral farmers feed cattle specially for the Christmas auction market, there might be 400 cattle, and out of the 400 you could not pick out 50 to compare in any way with the ordinary American cattle.

3833. You say not even those animals which are specially fed and prepared for the Christmas market?—That is so; the reason is that the market is swamped with cows and bulls, and taking the Hundred of Wirral as a whole it is not a very great beef-feeding country at all.

3834. If these cattle, which are specially prepared for the Christmas market, are not up to the standard, or only a few of them are up to the standard, of the ordinary American animals, it seems that you might argue from your point of view that the ordinary English animal is by no means up to the level of the American?—I maintain, as I said before, that American beef killed in Birkenhead will compare more favourably than the English meat will, because I have never had any complaint of it. I might give an illustration on that particular point. Last

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

Christmas I bought 13 bullocks, and they cost me 25*l.* apiece, in Stanley market.

3835. Where is that?—Just outside Liverpool. Two or three of my customers who had that beef said the next week: "Look here, I hope you are not giving us American beef this week," and that was the primest bullock. The reason was that it did not eat as tender as the American. I turned round and told them that I had got nothing else but American.

3836. Do you say that your customers said to you: "We would rather not have the American"?—No; they said: "I hope you are not giving us American beef this week, because last week it was not tender." I said: "What you got last week was English, and during the last six or eight weeks you have had nothing but American."

Mr. *Mildmay.*

3837. There is a strong feeling against American meat?—No; American meat eats tenderer than English.

3838. Then why did your customers say they hoped you were not giving them American?—Because the English meat the week before, which they took to be American, did not eat as tender as the American. I told them what it was. We make no bones of it in Birkenhead; we tell all our customers we deal in American beef.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3839. Under those circumstances, as you make no bones about it; and I do not see why you should; would you object to be registered as a dealer in foreign meat?—What benefit would that do?

3840. I am not asking whether it is a benefit; I ask, would you object to it?—I would not object. Why should you object when you are selling a good article? But I object to a meat marking Bill.

3841. You would not object to registration?—I cannot see why we should; we are selling a good article. But I do not see what benefit would arise from registration.

Chairman.

3842. According to the Bill, if it was carried you would not require to be registered, because you sell nothing but English meat and Birkenhead-killed meat, and neither come under the designation of the foreign meat in the Bill; therefore it would not affect you?—No.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

3843. You cannot imagine any honest butcher objecting to registration, so long as no onus is laid upon him?—I should think not. I think all butchers are honest, from what I have found.

3844. Have you read the evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords?—No.

3845. There it was established to an extent to convince anybody, I should think, that there was, I do not say in Birkenhead, but in certain districts, a great amount of misrepresentation as to the origin of the meat?—I cannot say as to that.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3846. We have had a considerable amount of evidence as to this question of registration, and as to whether people would object to it or not, and I thought, as a practical butcher, you might be able to express an opinion about it?—I think, even if the Bill was passed in its present form, the butchers would derive no benefit by registration, and the public would derive no benefit.

Chairman.

3847. Assuming that the public are under the impression that they get English meat or Birkenhead-killed meat, do you think it would be a protection to your trade, and to the trade of those who deal only in English and Birkenhead-killed meat, if a dealer in foreign meat was obliged to be registered?—I do not think it would be any benefit to us as long as Clause 15 is retained in the Bill.

3848. It has been said that those who deal in English meat would rather like those who sell foreign meat to be registered, so that the public might know when they were buying foreign meat, and in that way it is asserted butchers dealing in English meat would benefit, because they would get a larger amount of custom; do you think that would be so?—I do not think myself I should gain any benefit by registration.

Mr. *Doughty.*

3849. As regards the question of registration, as I understand you, in the first place you say you do not think it would be any advantage to you; do not you think that registration would be any advantage to the public?—No.

3850. You think it would be no protection to the public?—I do not think the public want protecting. If you stood behind the counter selling beef, you would see they are equally good judges as yourself in buying the beef.

3851. You think that the public are sufficiently well educated to judge good meat from bad?—The majority.

3852. Do they know foreign meat from English?—They know frozen meat.

3853. Is it the practice in your part of the country for English butchers, as they are called, to sell foreign meat as well; I mean, is it the practice for any foreign meat to be sold by the same people who sell English?—If you come to class Birkenhead-killed meat as foreign——

3854. I am not speaking of Birkenhead-killed meat. Take, for instance, New Zealand lambs in March; is it usual for butchers who deal in Birkenhead-killed meat and in English-fed meat to sell New Zealand lambs?—There are butchers who sell them.

3855. Is it a usual practice amongst you butchers at Birkenhead?—There is not much of that, because Birkenhead is pretty well stocked with cloth-meat shops, as we term them.

3856. Do the butchers who sell English beef and Birkenhead-killed beef ever sell frozen meat?—Speaking of the best class of butchers, no.

3857. Can you define what you mean by "the best class of butchers"; would you explain what you consider the best class of butchers?—I mean the man that will go to the Birkenhead lairage and buy the best class of meat; he would not deal in frozen meat.

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

3858. Do you consider the average butcher a "first-class butcher"?—Yes, I mean men who go to the lairage or to the public market. I may say there is very little chilled meat sold in Birkenhead, the majority of meat that is termed "frozen" is really frozen meat, not chilled.

3859. I suppose the Committee may take it that the butchers generally in Birkenhead and Liverpool who sell English-fed meat also deal in English-killed beef?—Yes, that is so.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

3860. Can you give the Committee any idea as to the proportion of cattle brought to Deptford as compared with that brought to Birkenhead; do you know which is the bigger?—Birkenhead is the bigger.

3861. It supplies a very large district, does it not?—Yes.

3862. The meat travels all over the north of England?—Yes.

3863. I suppose there is practically no other beef eaten at Birkenhead?—There is not much; what has driven us out of the English trade is the tuberculosis question. The authorities in Birkenhead have been more stringent as regards meat inspection than any other town in England, I may say.

3864. And that stringency of inspection has driven you more and more to deal only in American beef?—That is so.

3865. Will you tell the Committee why that is?—If, for instance, I went to a public auction or to a public market and bought three or four cattle, and brought them to Birkenhead and they were slaughtered, I have seen cases where an animal has been only slightly affected with tuberculosis where the authorities not only seize the animal, but they summons you to court; practically a man's business is ruined; he might practically just as well shut up his shop when once he is taken to court for having meat affected by tuberculosis; that has driven me out of the trade, and others besides.

3866. You find that occur with English cattle; do you find that ever occur with cattle imported alive from America?—Yes, but only a very small percentage.

3867. What sort of percentage?—I have not the figures of what arrives in Birkenhead before me, but it is a very small percentage indeed; I suppose it would be hardly 1 per cent., if it is that; I do not think it is that; I would not like to pin myself to that.

3868. One per cent. is rather a large percentage?—Yes; I would not like to pin myself to that, because I have not the actual figures by me.

3869. What would be the percentage of English cattle affected with tuberculosis as compared to that?—Speaking of the Hundred of Wirral, I should think it would be 10 or 12 per cent.

3870. Ten or 12 per cent. affected with tuberculosis?—Yes.

3871. We heard from a Canadian witness yesterday that the Canadian Government insist upon

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

upon all their cattle being tested with tuberculine before they are shipped; do you know if that is the case also with the States cattle?—I cannot say; I have read about it, but I cannot say whether it is true; we cannot believe all that we read in the press.

3872. As to the difference between Argentina and Canadian beef and States beef, the States beef is much the best of the three, is it not?—Yes.

3873. And Canadian the next?—Yes.

3874. And Argentina a very long way behind?—They are behind, but Argentina is getting better every year.

3875. The prices, I suppose, are tending to approximate every year?—Well, in the prices at the present time there is a great deal of difference.

3876. But they are not so widely different as they were a few years ago, are they?—No, not as regards the best of it; but with the inferior South American I should think it takes them all their time to cash some of it.

3877. We heard something from one of the witnesses about the "wild cattle of America"; I suppose that could only refer to these Argentine cattle. One witness protested against the "wild cattle from America" being described in this Bill as British cattle?—What part of America was he describing? The cattle that come from South America are not hand-fed cattle, but the majority of the cattle that come from America are hand-fed, and that makes them more domesticated.

3878. You say the best beasts that come now are as good as any English cattle fed in this country?—Yes.

3879. Could you tell the difference between the best Scotch and the best of your bullocks slaughtered at Birkenhead?—Do you mean when they are dead, or when they are alive?

3880. Both?—You could pick out some of the polled Angus cattle from America as to which you could hardly tell the difference; they are real pictures.

3881. And when they are dead, what would you say?—They are equally as good; that is, assuming you pick the best; you would have to get the best of both.

3882. I suppose you do get the best American cattle at Birkenhead?—The class of cattle that comes in at Birkenhead are really very good indeed.

3883. Do they get as good a price as Deptford?—I could not say.

3884. It was suggested yesterday by a Canadian witness that they would like all their meat to be marked "Canadian." I suppose you think it would be very unfair to class all the live meat that is slaughtered at Birkenhead into one category; it would not be fair, for instance, to have a special designation, say "British-killed" or something like that for all meat killed at the port, and to class it altogether under one category?—Under the Bill, it would be marked as "British."

3885. What I mean is this: it has been suggested by some of the witnesses that Clause 15, which classes your meat as "British," ought not

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

to be retained in the Bill, and that your meat ought to be marked as coming from abroad; if that were so, do you think it would be fair to class all that meat together in one category?—If you take out Clause 15 the Bill becomes unworkable, you cannot work it.

3886. I will come to that in a moment. Would you please answer my question: do you think it would be fair to put into one category, and mark with one label, the beasts that come from the States, and Canada, and from South America, and class them all as the same sort of meat under a meat-marking Bill?—Yes.

3887. Do you think it would be fair to class them all together?—Yes, because I maintain it would be unworkable if Clause 15 is not in the Bill, so far as that trade goes.

3888. Supposing Parliament in its wisdom or its folly did pass such a Bill, would it be fair to class those three classes of meat together?—I should think it would be fair, although there would be a difference in the quality of the meat, because the meat that is killed in this country——

3889. In that case, you do not think there would be any advantage whatever in adopting the suggestion of our Canadian witness of marking some as "Canadian"?—There would be the same amount of litigation with marking Canadian as there would be with marking the other. A man that has been in the trade can tell some of the Canadian cattle when they are dead, but not all of them.

3890. If the suggestion of the Canadian witness were carried out, and all Canadian cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead had to be marked after they were killed as "Canadian," you would have to have a separate slaughter-house and separate arrangements for them?—Yes, you would have to have separate arrangements, and I do not know how many inspectors. My opinion of inspectors is, from their first position in life they have the policeman's instinct about them.

3891. I want to get this point settled first, before you come to that; I want to see whether it would be desirable to carry out the suggestion of the Canadian witness?—I do not think it would; I may say that all the American cattle that come into this country are marked with a tag in the ear when they arrive; the Canadians are not and the South Americans are not.

3892. Now, will you tell us what you wanted to say just now as to the impossibility of carrying out the Bill?—I say it would be unworkable. If you got a Canadian bullock and an American bullock and put them in one shop, how are you to keep them apart?

3893. It has been suggested that there should be two different counters, that at one foreign meat should be sold, and at the other English; do you think that is a practicable suggestion?—I am positive it is not; it is a ridiculous idea; it is not practicable at all.

3894. With regard to your meat, if it was only marked after it was killed upon the sides and afterwards cut up into small pieces, there would be no possibility of any inspector whatever telling whether it was American, or States, or Scotch, would there?—He could not; he could

Sir *Elliott Lees*—continued.

pass an opinion, but he could not be positive what it was.

3895. He could not swear to it in a court of justice?—No, inspectors are like policemen; they will swear anything when they get into the box for their own ends.

3896. If there is any dishonesty going on, or any fraud in the way of misrepresentation, the passing of this Bill would not prevent that fraud; a dishonest man would be able to practise his fraud just as much then as now?—Yes, but the Merchandise Marks Act would deal with that. There was a case in Manchester some years ago, and they got a conviction.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

3897. The Merchandise Marks Act only takes cognisance of a case where there is some indication of the place of origin printed or marked on the article which is imported?—That is so.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

3898. Under another Act, if a man makes an express declaration and then sells as English what is foreign, I think he can be prosecuted?—Yes.

3899. There would be no greater facilities for finding out fraud if this Bill were passed than as the law now stands?—No.

3900. After the meat was cut up into small pieces, you think in the case of the best qualities it would be practically impossible for any inspector to distinguish it sufficiently to swear to it?—That is so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

3901. You have read the Bill all through, I suppose?—I have rushed through it.

3902. You are in favour, I take it, of Clause 15?—Yes.

3903. And practically that is the only part of the Bill you are in favour of?—I do not deal in the other lines of the trade, so that I have not taken any notice of the other part.

3904. Are you in favour of any other part of the Bill except Clause 15?—There are other portions of the Bill which I do not believe in.

3905. Are there other portions of the Bill that you are in favour of?—No; I do not believe in a meat-marking Bill at all.

3906. Then you are not in favour of any other portion of the Bill except Clause 15. I quite understand that you are in the Birkenhead killed meat trade. I heard you give a sort of definition of a "first-class butcher" as a man who goes to the lairage to buy meat?—I say the lairage or a market.

3907. Now, with regard to the question of tuberculosis; we have had some evidence from some of the previous witnesses as to this question, and a good deal was made of the fact that there was no tuberculosis in these imported animals. Now, I understand you to say that there is certainly 1 per cent.?—No, I say I will not pin myself to that, because I do not know the figures.

3908. Will you, at any rate, pin yourself to the 10 or 12 per cent. you gave us for the Hundred of Wirral?—I am very nearly positive it is so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

3909. You will pin yourself to that?—Yes.

3910. But you will not pin yourself to the 1 per cent.; there is a difference of 2 per cent. between the 10 and 12 per cent. you mentioned; which of those percentages do you pin yourself to?—I do not know the number of animals coming into Woodside (that is Birkenhead); but the percentage is very small indeed at Woodside.

3911. Would you pin yourself to 10 per cent. or 12 per cent. in the case of the Hundred of Wirral cattle?—Ten per cent.

3912. You come down to 10 per cent.?—Yes.

3913. Now will you kindly tell the Committee, as you have come down from 12 to 10 per cent., on what authority you make the statement that 10 per cent. of the cattle in the Hundred of Wirral are affected with tuberculosis?—On the authority of our association; men who have actually bought cattle and had them seized.

3914. I suppose other people have bought cattle besides your association in the Hundred of Wirral?—We are taking the cattle that has been sent.

3915. With regard to cattle bought by other people, have you taken the percentage of those as to tuberculosis?—We do not stop in Birkenhead and keep our tongue between our teeth and not speak to our neighbours round about Wirral; we have talked it right out and we have come to the conclusion that the percentage is very large indeed; we will say 10 per cent.

3916. That is rather a serious statement to make with regard to the farmers and dealers of cattle in any district, that 10 per cent. of their cattle are affected with tuberculosis; do I understand that you make that on the authority of your association?—We have talked the thing over; we have gone to an auction and seen so many cattle there, and seen that there have been so many cattle seized.

3917. There is no other authority besides the authority of your association that you make that statement on?—No.

3918. I think you live in Birkenhead?—Yes.

3919. I suppose you do not happen to have seen an article the other day in a sanitary paper concerning the death rate of Birkenhead. Do you happen to know what the death rate of Birkenhead is?—I think about 18.

3920. Is it not higher than that?—It varies.

3921. We know that it varies at times, but taking the percentage for a year what is the death rate; do you know for certain that it is not higher than 18 per cent.?—I am not going to answer that question right off without having the statistics before me. I could send them to you in writing.

3922. I understand you were against marking "Canadian," or any other marking?—Yes.

3923. If the Canadians want to make arrangements to mark their cattle when they come over to this country, why are you against their doing

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

doing so?—Because I do not believe in meat-marking.

3924. If people want to mark their meat which comes over to this country so that every animal wherever it is sold may be identified as Canadian, why do you not believe in it?—I have not read anything yet that has given me any idea of what this mark would be. How could you mark a bullock when it is cut up into 400 or 500 pieces?

3925. I am not going into that?—We must go into that; I am a retailer.

3926. A great deal of the dead meat that comes over to this country now is marked, is it not?—Yes, it is all marked.

3927. The Canadians only want to mark the meat killed in this country?—Do they want to mark each piece, or to mark the quarters or the carcases?

3928. That does not matter?—Is it marking the carcases——

3929. You are not here to ask questions, but to answer questions from me; why do you not believe in the Canadians marking their meat if they want to?—I maintain that it is not practicable to mark beef. If it is only marking the carcases it would make no difference.

3930. I take it that your objection so far is simply owing to the difficulty there would be in marking, but supposing they see their way to overcoming that difficulty, do you still not believe in it?—They had better show first what their way is. I cannot answer that question till I know what the way is.

3931. Supposing they see a way of overcoming that difficulty as to marking it, would you still not believe in it?—If they could convince me that it was practicable then I suppose I would believe.

3932. And your objection to it would fall at once?—But I maintain that it is utter nonsense to try and mark meat at all.

3933. But we have supposed that the difficulty of marking is overcome; I do not ask *you* to overcome the difficulty, but supposing *they* overcome the difficulty, have you any further objection?—I do not think I can answer the question unless I know what is proposed——

3934. My point is this: I want to know from you whether you have any other objection than the difficulty of marking?—Do you mean marking the carcases?

3935. Yes?—There is no difficulty in marking the carcases of meat.

3936. I am assuming that they do away with the difficulty; I understand you to say you have no objection to marking meat in the carcase?—No; what does it matter to the retailer if it is marked in the carcase?

3937. Your only objection is as to the difficulty of carrying it out?—How are you to describe it when the official comes into your place? He cannot detect it himself after it is cut up.

3938. Your only objection to marking is the difficulty of carrying it out?—That is the biggest objection.

Mr. *Heywood-Johnstone.*

3939. You do not see how it is to be done?—No.

3940. That is your real objection?—That is the biggest objection. If we buy a carcase of

Mr. *Heywood-Johnstone*—continued.

meat how are we to mark each small piece; a chop, for instance. Sometimes with the pickings of the bones we have sometimes a couple of thousand pieces; are all these little bits of an ounce or two ounces to be marked?

3941. Really your objection is that it is impracticable?—Yes.

3942. If it was practicable is there any reason against it?—It is simply impracticable.

3943. Assume for the moment that it is practicable?—It would not be workable.

3944. But so far as the principle is concerned you see no objection?—I do. As I have stated before, I do not believe in meat marking at all.

3945. I want to get it clearly from you, your objection arises solely from the impracticability of it?—First of all, I do not believe in meat marking at all; I do not believe it is practicable to mark meat.

3946. If the purchaser wishes for some guidance as to the article he is purchasing, do you see in principle any objection to its being denoted in some way or other?—If a customer comes into my shop and asks me, "Is this English beef?" we tell him what it is; that it is American beef killed in Birkenhead. We have people come into the shop to ask whether it is English, and we say, "No, it is American," and when we tell them that they do not go out of the shop; they stop and buy it.

3947. But supposing the purchaser wants a further assurance; supposing he has not your excellent good faith to depend upon, is there any objection in principle to letting him know what he is buying?—If an ordinary individual went to a shop to buy a particular joint of meat and it was marked with a particular colour, I do not think he would buy that joint.

3948. That is not the point; I want to know your personal and individual opinion, and I ask you, Is there any objection in principle to the purchaser knowing what he is buying?—If a person asks what he is buying he is told; but I object to meat marking. If he asks what nationality it is he gets his answer truthfully.

3949. Does he always get his answer truthfully?—Yes. I give all my assistants strict injunctions——

3950. I am not speaking of your own case, but do you suppose that in every instance a person who sends for English beef gets it?—I do not suppose there is one in a thousand who enters my shop that asks for it——

3951. I am not dealing with your shop, I am dealing with the general retail trade of the Kingdom?—I can only speak of Birkenhead, and in the retail trade of Birkenhead people very rarely ask what country the meat belongs to.

3952. Supposing a person did come in and ask for English meat, is there any reason in principle why the meat he purchases should not have something upon it to denote what it is?—We tell him. I maintain it is impracticable to mark meat.

3953. There you come back to the same point that we parted from long ago. Is there any objection in your mind beyond the impracticability of it?—I say I do not believe in marking meat.

3954. You have said that again and again?—

Mr. *Heywood-Johnstone*—continued.

You cannot convince me that it is practicable. I maintain that meat should not be marked. I cannot go out of my way to show how it should be marked.

3955. I do not ask you to do that; I ask whether your objection is simply and solely the impracticability of it, or whether you have any further objection?—As I stated before, I think previously to your entering the room, we would never be free from litigation.

3956. That is your only objection?—I should think that is a very strong objection.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

3957. Do you speak for Birkenhead, or do you speak for the whole county of Lancashire?—I have nothing to do with Lancashire, only Birkenhead.

3958. What was the price per cwt. or per stone of American meat in Birkenhead, say last week?—3*s.* 2*d.*

3959. What was the price of English beef in Stanley market?—Do you mean dead weight?

3960. Take it either dead or alive, but taking the same in the two cases?—I can only give you the paper figure. The paper figure was 4*s.* 4*d.*, that is live English cattle, at the Stanley cattle market.

3961. Would you give me the dead meat price per lb., or per cwt., or per ton, in the same way for American in Birkenhead, and the price for English for the same weight in Stanley market on the same day, either last week or any date you like?—According to last Monday's trade the paper quoted the best meat at from 6½*d.* to 4¾*d.* That is for the Liverpool Stanley cattle market; I was not there; I am giving what the paper quoted. That was live meat; then there was the percentage to come off that, that would leave about 5½*d.* per lb. for the best meat, and 4¾*d.* for the lairage meat.

3962. What I want is the dead weight?—It would be about 5½*d.* for the English, and 4¾*d.* for the American lairage meat.

3963. That is ¾*d.* a lb. difference?—Yes.

3964. I understood you to say, in reply to an honourable Member just now, that you disagreed with a former witness as to the difference?—Yes. A former witness stated it as 1*d.* to 2*d.*

3965. You say it is ¾*d.*?—I say from ½*d.* to ¾*d.*; I am only giving you the paper price for Stanley market, and I am giving you my own knowledge of the other.

3966. I take it that the paper price is correct?—I cannot say.

3967. Is that about the difference all the year round?—That is about the difference, from ½*d.* to ¾*d.* On Monday evening I met a few of my traders who deal in Irish cattle, and they told me that the only difference, taking it on the average, would be from ½*d.* to ¾*d.*

3968. We are here in the middle of the Summer, but take the month of January, for instance, would there be no greater difference in the month of January as between the price of English beef and American?—No, they would be about equal in January; there is a larger difference now than there would be then.

3969. You mean there is more difference in favour of English meat at this time of the year?—Yes; you must bear in mind that the Birkenhead market at the lairage is one of the dearest American meat markets in this country.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

3970. Why is that?—I cannot say. Beef is dearer in Birkenhead than it is in London.

3971. Is that because it is better than it is at Deptford, or because there is more demand for it?—If Londoners want it they must come to Birkenhead, and that would put up the price; but they do not want it now.

3972. Can you tell me what proportion of the cattle that go into Birkenhead are from the United States?—I could not say.

3973. Are half of the cattle that go into Birkenhead from the United States?—Yes, more than half.

3974. The cattle into Birkenhead are mainly from the United States and Canada, are they not?—Yes, and South America.

3975. Those three countries cover all the cattle that come in to Birkenhead?—Yes, I do not think there is any other sent.

3976. Except from Canada, the United States, and South America?—Yes.

3977. Can you give the Committee any idea of the relative proportions that come into Birkenhead from those three countries?—I could not say.

3978. Do as many come from the States as from the other two countries put together?—I could not say.

3979. Do as many come from Argentina as from the other two countries?—No; I do not think so. I would not like to pin myself as to the other two.

3980. Are you able to say what proportion of the cattle that comes from the States are first-class cattle, or are they all first-class?—The majority of them are first-class.

3981. What proportion are first-class; would it be three-fourths?—Fully that.

3982. You tell us that the first-class United States cattle are better than any English cattle?—Yes.

3983. Now, if that is so (I will take it that it is) would it not be to your advantage or to the advantage of any other agent in your trade dealing with United States first-class cattle to be registered for the sale of this beef, because it would let the public know you were dealing in an article that was superior even to Aberdeen beef?—I do not believe it at all.

3984. Why. Is it not to the advantage of any trader that everybody should know that he deals in a very superior article?—They all know I deal in it; they see my carts and waggons going down to the lairage every day.

3985. Is not every trader glad to get a gratuitous advertisement?—I think the goods I sell come up to that; I never advertise or put a ticket on my meat, and I think I get a fair share of the trade of Birkenhead.

3986. No doubt your own trade is the best advertisement you could have, but at the same time do you not think that any additional advertisement would not do you any harm?—No, I am well enough known without advertising.

3987. You are against this Bill, stock, lock, and barrel?—I am against any Bill for meat marking.

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

marking. If you want to mark, mark flour, or American oysters, or a hundred different things that want marking.

3988. Where are the cattle that are fed in Wirral killed?—Some are slaughtered at the Tranmere abattoir, the public abattoir in the borough of Birkenhead. There are other country butchers that kill them at their own private slaughter-houses.

3989. What I want to know is this: You told us that 10 per cent. of the cattle fed in the Wirral district were affected with tuberculosis; do I take your last answer to mean this: that a large number of cattle fed in the Wirral district are killed at this particular slaughter-house that you mention?—No, they are not all killed there.

3990. A large number?—No, I think the larger proportion are killed on the outskirts.

3991. A certain proportion are killed there; I will take any proportion you like?—I tell you I have not got the figures, so that it is no use my pinning myself to actual figures.

3992. What I want to know is this: Could you tell the Committee what percentage of the cattle fed in the Wirral district killed at this slaughter-house which you have mentioned have been reported by the inspectors as affected with tuberculosis?—I could not for the moment.

3993. Would you be able later on to send in any memorandum or paper to the Committee which would inform the Committee of the exact proportion of cattle fed in Wirral killed at this slaughter-house you mention which have been found to be affected with tuberculosis?—The cattle are not described as they go in as from Wirral or anywhere else, and I do not suppose they would have the actual figures.

Chairman.

3994. You say they are not distinguished?—No.

3995. There would be some record, I presume, of the total number reported out of the whole, but I understand you to say the Wirral cattle are not distinguished from the other cattle killed there?—That is so.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

3996. Then how is it that you have any practical experience enabling you to make this sweeping charge that you have made against the Wirral cattle, that 10 per cent. of them are affected with tuberculosis?—By as it were comparing notes, one butcher speaking with another about the cattle he has lost.

Chairman.

3997. You gave us your authority, which was, as I understood, the opinion of your association, was not that so?—Yes, the association and men of the trade who are out of it.

3998. That is without statistics?—Yes.

3999. It was just their own knowledge and the opinion, or I might say the guess, which they have formed?—Yes.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

4000. It was merely an expression of opinion?—Yes.

Chairman.

4001. It was a pure guess founded upon what they thought?—Yes.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4002. Has your association, as an association, ever passed any resolution or made any public declaration as to the large number of cattle killed in the Wirral district or any other district that are affected with tuberculosis?—We have never made any statement of statistics, but I will tell you what we have done: we have let certain farmers alone, we would not touch them at all.

4003. Would the Committee be correct in taking it that what you stated as 10 per cent. came to your knowledge merely from conversations?—That is so, from conversations among our own traders.

4004. Can you tell us what local authority has the power to seize animals affected with tuberculosis which are killed in this particular abattoir?—The Health Committee of the County Borough of Birkenhead.

4005. In face of the strong statements made by you, I think we ought to have from that authority the actual statistics of tuberculosis so as to test it. What I want to get is the percentage of English cattle killed within the Birkenhead district affected with tuberculosis?—I think you could not get that, and I will tell you why: a lot of cattle are bought at auctions and killed in the country, they are afraid of bringing them into Birkenhead; I do not know what is done with them in the country; I have nothing to do with them.

Chairman.

4006. In Birkenhead, are the Cheshire cattle killed in the same abattoir as the landed cattle?—In the same as the Irish cattle; they are all killed in one place.

4007. Then it would be a question whether the inspector divided the English from the imported; perhaps you cannot say whether in the statistics he does divide them?—I cannot say; I should think he would not, but he might.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4008. Are the English-fed cattle taken into the same abattoir at Birkenhead as the foreign?—No, the same as the Irish.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

4009. The inspector would keep a different record for the beasts killed at Tranmere and for the beasts killed at Woodside, I presume?—Yes.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4010. What I want to get is the percentage of cattle affected with tuberculosis killed at Tranmere where the English-fed cattle are killed, as I understand. That is what I want to get, because it is a very serious statement to have upon the evidence that 10 per cent. of the cattle in any district are affected with tuberculosis?—You would not get the figure of 10 per cent. from this public abattoir; because, as I say, there are cattle that are affected that are killed within the Hundred of Wirral that the local authority cannot touch in any way whatever.

Sir *Elliott Lees.*

4011. Mr. Davies, one of the Wirral farmers, gave some evidence: at Question 1132 he is asked, "A great many oxen have been condemned?" and he says, "I do not think there have been a great many, but there have been some condemned with tuberculosis; there have not been a great many. Mr. Wagstaff is at Birkenhead; Birkenhead and Liverpool are both adjoining, and beasts that will pass in Liverpool will not pass in Birkenhead, lots of them; therefore, the majority of the beasts now are not killed at Birkenhead." I take it that refers to English cattle; are any of your American cattle taken over to be killed in Liverpool?—No.

4012. They must be killed in Birkenhead?—At the port of landing.

4013. Therefore, when he speaks of cattle being taken over to Liverpool to be killed, those are English-bred cattle?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

4014. Do you say 10 per cent. of the beasts killed at Birkenhead are affected with tuberculosis?—No.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4015. You say that 10 per cent. of the cattle fed in the Hundred of Wirral and killed, wherever they may be killed, are affected by tuberculosis?—Yes.

4016. Do you suggest that as regards cattle fed in the Wirral district and bought by a butcher in some other districts of Cheshire or Lancashire than either Birkenhead or Liverpool, a man has any better chance of evading the inspector and getting them through by slaughtering them in his own private slaughter-house, than if he was obliged to take them to the public abattoir?—There is no inspector over the private slaughter-houses in the country districts.

4017. Is there not a sanitary inspector there?—What does a clodhopper coming from the plough know about tuberculosis; what does a policeman going into a private slaughter-house know as to whether the cattle are affected with tuberculosis or not?

Mr. *Brigg.*

4018. As regards those inspectors, complaint must be made before the inspector can go and look at the carcase?—Yes.

Chairman.

4019. I have made a note as to the information that is desired and I will see if we can obtain it; viz., statistics of the percentage of the cattle killed at Tranmere affected with tuberculosis, and the percentage of cattle killed at Woodside affected with tuberculosis?——

Mr. *Brigg.*

4020. Your 10 per cent. would include a district outside which would come under a different health authority?—Yes, but they have no meat inspection whatever.

Chairman.

4021. As regards this 10 per cent. you mention, I understand you to say it is the mere opinion, or, as I ventured to call it, the guess of your association?—That is so.

Mr. *Kilbivde.*

4022. It is not the opinion of the association, as I understand, it is merely the opinion of members of the association meeting together in conversation; the association, as an association, I understand from you, have never pronounced any opinion?—That is so.

Chairman.

4023. The association has not any definite statistics, as I understand?—No.

Mr. WILLIAM COGGAN, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

4024. ARE you deputy-chairman of the Meat and Cattle Trade Section of the London Chamber of Commerce?—I am.

4025. Chairman of the London Butchers' Trade Society, and vice-chairman of the National Federation of Butchers and Meat Traders?—I am.

4026. I believe you gave evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1893?—I did.

4027. Before I go into detail, might I ask whether the evidence you will give us to-day will be practically the same as you gave before the Lords Committee?—As far as my memory serves me; I have not read their Report since; I have tried to find it, but I cannot find it.

4028. As far as you know, is there anything in your evidence before the Lords Committee but what you can corroborate now?—Not that I am aware of.

4029. Are you aware that we have had before the Committee Mr. William Cooper, who is chairman of the same section of the London Chamber that you are vice-chairman of?—Yes.

Chairman—continued.

4030. May I take it generally (of course there may be little points of difference) that your evidence would be in the same direction as Mr. Cooper's?—Yes; in the same direction with regard to my view of the Bill, but I have not read Mr. Cooper's evidence, nor was I present when he gave it.

4031. Do you take the same view of the Bill as Mr. Cooper, speaking generally?—I do.

4032. Have you had a long experience of the meat trade, both alive and dead?—I have.

4033. In what capacity?—My father is a cattle dealer; I became a butcher myself at the age of 19, and I have been in the trade ever since. I had the honour of serving Her Majesty at Windsor for some years; since then I have been in London, and have been engaged in the live and dead trade, and also have been hide buyer at Deptford,

Chairman—continued.

Deptford, as representing the London Butchers' Hide and Skin Company.

4034. May I take it that you are well acquainted with both the wholesale and retail trade?—And also with the breeding of cattle. My father was a farmer, and there is no part of the trade but what I am intimately connected with.

4035. Are you in favour of this Bill, or are you opposed to it?—I am opposed to it.

4036. Are you opposed to any Bill for marking meat?—I am.

4037. Are you prepared to give your reasons for opposing the Bill?—Yes.

4038. Will you give me your first reason which you have against the principle of the Bill?—The first reason I have is because of the perishable nature of the article. Any interference with the ordinary treatment will undoubtedly entail loss, and, as a consequence of loss, there must be a rise in price. This will apply more particularly to the meat imported from the Continent. Any cargo detained only for a few hours so as to miss that day's market, will most likely become a total loss during the summer months, and prevent the sender from taking such a risk a second time.

4039. Is that reason founded on the assumption that what will be required if this Bill passes is, that when the dead meat is landed from the Continent or from any other place, it will have to be marked either by some official or by some authority, or by the owner of it?—I assume that.

4040. Is there anything in the Bill to justify that assumption?—It makes it a criminal offence to deal in any foreign meat.

4041. I am dealing now with the question of where the marking is to take place. Assuming that the meat was marked when it arrived, your reason would not apply at all, would it?—Quite so; if it was marked before it arrived it would go straight to the market.

4042. There is nothing in this Bill, is there, that absolutely makes it compulsory that the meat should be marked on landing. I quite admit that you might draw that assumption from it for this reason, that it says that "all carcases and other imported dead meat to be marked in accordance with rules to be drawn up by the Board of Agriculture." Therefore, do you assume that it would have to be marked in some way at the port of disembarkation?—Yes.

4043. That does not apply to the Canadian meat we have heard of, and which you have heard has to be marked before it comes over, does it?—We have no Canadian meat so far as I understand it; in my experience I have seen no Canadian meat except what comes alive.

4044. There has been evidence given that there has been one lot sent alive?—I have not seen that evidence.

4045. Can you say if Australian meat is marked at present?—There has been a label attached to the leg of the sheep or lamb, but it is not marked.

4046. Are you supposing that this Bill would make it compulsory that there should be marking on this side when meat is disembarked?—I take it from Clauses 3 and 4 that it will be an offence to have it on your premises unless it is marked.

Chairman—continued.

4047. Therefore, do you point out that owing to the perishable nature of the article it will be very difficult indeed to organise a system which would not entail loss and injury?—Quite so. Then if you deal with the frozen meat which is distributed very largely without coming through the market at all, it would of course be a necessity that it should be inspected at the docks, because there is a very large quantity of frozen meat that goes through the retail shops without going into any market.

4048. Is that inspected now?—Not that I am aware of.

4049. I suppose there is a certain amount of inspection in the retail shops in the various districts, is there not?—In my experience of a quarter of a century I have never seen any in my shops.

4050. But in most of the provincial towns and in London inspectors do inspect the retail shops, do they not?—The inspector would undoubtedly, but the greater part of this meat, in fact all of it, speaking roughly, is in a sound condition, and therefore the inspectors, whatever they may do, so seldom find anything to complain of, so far as the soundness of the article is concerned, that really it becomes a waste of time, but if it is a question of marking of course there must be the inspection.

4051. Have you a second reason?—Yes, my second reason is because of the impossibility of any test to decide what is British and what is foreign when once the meat has been placed in a refrigerating chamber. This will apply more particularly to the metropolis, for the greater portion of the meat consumed in London passes through the Central Meat Market, the retailer being compelled to preserve it in the refrigerating chambers, having no means of slaughtering his own animals.

4052. That makes another assumption, which is, that the meat in this case would have to be marked in the Central Meat Market, does it not?—It must be marked before it is dealt with.

4053. But if the foreign meat was all marked when it was imported, it would not require to be marked at the meat market, would it?—Quite so.

4054. So far as I have pointed out, your previous reason was on the assumption that it was all marked at the port of disembarkation?—But my second reason is not on those lines; my second reason is this: that when the English or Scotch meat has been placed in our refrigerating chambers, and remains there for a week or 10 days, it is so much like the imported beef or New Zealand mutton that there is no one who can detect the difference between the two.

4055. Quite so; but if all foreign meat is marked when it is imported, and if that is considered sufficient by the law, there will be no marking at the cattle meat market, will there?—Quite so.

4056. And if there was no marking at the cattle meat market, then your objection would not come in, would it, because nobody would have to go and distinguish there; the marking would have been done already?—No, but I presume

Chairman—continued.

the inspection would be at the shops, and when the retailer had placed his English or Scotch meat in the refrigerating chambers it becomes so much like the imported meat that there is no possibility of deciding which is which.

4057. Are you assuming that in addition to the marking at the port which you have given us your reasons for objecting to, when it was cut up there would have to be fresh marking, and that that would be compulsory under the Bill?—I am not assuming that at all, but I am assuming the inspector would often make a great mistake.

4058. If he saw the mark on the carcase it would be sufficient for him, would it not?—Quite so, but I am not fearing that side of the question, I am fearing the other side of the question, namely, that a prosecution would take place because he would think we are misrepresenting what we are not misrepresenting.

4059. Are you now dealing with prosecutions for selling foreign meat?—For having on our premises meat which an inspector will believe or say is foreign, when it is English, because when it has once been put in the refrigerating chamber it is difficult to distinguish it.

4060. But if it is marked at the port of disembarkation that settles it, does it not?—Quite so.

4061. Do you mean that the inspector's assumption would be that foreign meat would surreptitiously get in without being marked at the point of disembarkation?—Yes, quite so.

4062. And that he would, under the Bill, act to prevent that being sold?—Quite so; that is the danger which, as a retailer, I see in this Bill, and I think that danger is very, very great.

4063. What is your third reason for opposing the Bill?—Because of the enormous expense which will be incurred without a proportionate benefit being obtained. The present inspectors for the most part I consider quite unqualified for the work. I think from the returns which we had some time ago as to the experience which the sanitary inspectors of London had with regard to meat, it appeared that only two or three had ever been engaged in the meat trade or had had any connection whatever with it. Some of them, I think, were ticket collectors, some bricklayers, and so on, but they had had no experience in dealing with meat.

4064. I suppose their duty would be merely what you describe as passing sound meat or detecting unsound meat?—Quite so.

4065. And do you think that, although they may be qualified for that work, they would not be qualified for this work that would be thrown upon them of distinguishing between foreign and British meat?—I do not think they have been appointed even with the view of deciding whether it is sound or unsound meat, as the other side of the question. That is so as to other things. We, as a London Butchers' Trade Society, of which I have been chairman for many years, have had to deal with some of these inspectors and we have proved conclusively that they have had no knowledge whatever on the question of sound or unsound meat.

4066. Then you do not consider them to be

Chairman—continued.

experts even with regard to the soundness of meat, and *à fortiori* they are not qualified to distinguish between British and foreign meat, are they?—Quite so.

4067. And also you point out, do you, that the expense would be considerable?—Enormous.

4068. Then I think you have an objection to taking samples without going through the form of purchase, have you not?—Yes, I have a great objection to that. I object to the arbitrary power proposed to be given to inspectors to take samples without going through the form of purchase. The tradesman must in every case be the loser, as the meat would be most likely unsaleable when returned, and I am of opinion that in the case of mutton, lamb, veal, and pork, nothing less than the entire carcase will be sufficient to obtain a decision, and in the case of beef nothing less than an entire quarter.

4069. So that you would say that the inspection of retail shops, where the meat was cut into smaller pieces, would be perfectly futile, would you?—Perfectly futile. I heard the evidence of the chief inspector of the market, and I agree with him as to the means of deciding on a portion of the carcase.

4070. Therefore the inspection, in your opinion, could only be properly carried out in the wholesale markets?—Quite so, and there of course there is no difficulty, because it is all known.

4071. You mean, do you, because it is all known?—Yes.

4072. Then you have another objection to the provision enabling a private person to institute a prosecution, have you not?—I have. I think the provision enabling a private person to institute a prosecution is very objectionable, as the butcher would have no means of defence. He would not know, and could not possibly know, what had been sold last week or the week before, and as the meat would have been consumed he would have no means of defending his case at all.

4073. Will you refer me to the clause of the Bill which you are alluding to?—The latter portion of Clause 10. "Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall prevent any private person from instituting a prosecution for an offence under this Act." I maintain if a prosecution is to take place notice should be given at once or before the meat is even cooked, then a butcher would have the means of defending himself.

4074. In fact, would it be necessary that notice should be given before the meat is taken away from the shop, and that it should be impounded, as it were?—Quite so, otherwise one might never be able to trace whether the meat actually came out of a particular shop or not.

4075. And the position of the court would be simply the evidence of one witness against the other, would it not?—Quite so. Then again, I think it is provided that a prosecution might take place within three months. Clause 11 says: "All prosecutions under this Act shall be conducted in a summary manner before any justices in petty sessions assembled having jurisdiction in the place where the alleged offence was committed, and no prosecution for an offence under this Act shall be instituted after the expiration of

three

Chairman—continued.

three calendar months next after the day on which the alleged offence was committed."

4076. Therefore two months and three weeks afterwards a prosecution might take place when all evidence had gone except the evidence of the butcher on the one hand?—Exactly; he would have no evidence. It would be ridiculous to say he could remember what had been sold two or three months ago.

4077. A prosecutor would have no evidence either, would he?—I cannot tell what action he might have taken to get up a case, because it might be a case of blackmail; we have heard of that.

4078. Do you deal with the question of the 15th clause of the Bill?—I have not, because I agree with what has been said here over and over again, that if you take out that clause you have done with the Bill.

4079. Do you object, as Mr. Cooper objected, to the 15th clause, which makes the live meat, killed at the ports, British meat?—No, I do not object to that at all; I am not a Scotchman, sir, and you will make a little allowance for the country of one's origin.

4080. Then I will ask you what is your view of that clause, I will read it: "The words 'British or Irish meat' means meat killed within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man." That clause you understand makes live cattle killed at Birkenhead and Deptford British meat?—Yes.

4081. What is your opinion as to that?—My opinion is that if you take that clause out and they are to be classed as foreign, there are no means of carrying such a provision into effect. Secondly, there is no reason why that should be done because the average quality of the imported cattle is superior to the average quality of our own cattle, a conclusion to which the House of Lords' Committee arrived, I think, in their Report. Further than that, if you are going to class that meat as foreign, of course it will be sold according to the price and the quality of the meat. The accusation of fraud which has been made against the trade is an accusation which at present I have never heard proved, misrepresentation not excepted. Again and again meat has been said to be of a country of origin which it has not been, but the price at which that article has been sold would have been conclusive proof to the purchaser that it was not; if he had taken the trouble to examine the prices relatively to the best Scotch meat, and that which he was purchasing, he would have seen at once that he was not paying for the best Scotch meat. To confirm that, I have taken the trouble to bring three price lists, one from the Army and Navy Stores, one from the British Produce Supply Company, with which the Earl of Winchelsea is connected, and one from Harrod's Stores. In the case of the Army and Navy and the Earl of Winchelsea's Company, they both list Scotch and English meat. Harrod's Stores say "beef;" they make the distinction merely beef, and they charge a penny per pound less than the Army and Navy or the Earl of Winchelsea, and the price at Harrod's Stores is the usual price of the retail trade in the West-end of London, unless there has been a special contract made or a special request made that the customer shall be supplied with a given article, then of course the contract made must be carried out, and the customer supplied with a given article; but if nothing is said as to the price or the place of origin of the meat, the ordinary price of the retail trade is Harrod's Store price. Nothing is said as to the place of origin; no question is asked, and no one cares; and I daresay Harrod's Stores will sell more meat than the other two put together. They have only come up since the Army and Navy Stores have been in existence; they have adopted the principle all through, that the public do not know and do not want to know. It is simply a question of price; and the question of fraud I repudiate.

Chairman—continued.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

4082. You said that the price at Harrod's Stores was a penny a pound less than the price at the Army and Navy Stores, did you not?—Yes.

4083. In the Army and Navy price list there is so much for English meat and so much for foreign meat, is there not?—Quite so.

4084. Which did you refer to?—I referred to the best English meat. Their prices for American beef in the Army and Navy Stores are as a rule a penny a pound less than the English price.

4085. Does that correspond with Harrod's price?—Harrod's price list I find last week was a halfpenny a pound higher for their beef than it has been for the whole year up to the Jubilee. I made inquiries; I told them I was going to make use of their price list here, and they were quite agreeable. They said they had charged up to the Jubilee 10½*d.* per lb. for what the Army and Navy Stores charged 11½*d.*

4086. What is the Army and Navy Stores' price for the best American?—The Army and Navy price for the best American sirloins is 10½*d.*

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

4087. Does not the existence of the Army and Navy Stores and Lord Winchelsea's Stores show that some people ask the difference in price?—I am really referring to the general public

Chairman.

4088. May I take it that you are in favour, if this Bill is passed by Parliament, of leaving Clause 15 as it is?—I see no other way of doing it.

4089. As to your opinion of the effect of such a Bill as this, if it was passed, on the sale of American beef, and English beef, what do you say?—I am of opinion that this Bill will increase the sale of American refrigerated beef to the detriment of the home producer, especially as to South American beasts and sheep which, being killed at the port of landing, will become British. To go further into that, the best American refrigerated beef must of necessity be superior to what comes alive, even leaving out the inferior quality of the South American beef, which is every year greatly improving. In my opinion, in the course of two or three years

Chairman—continued.

we shall get that beef of such a quality that it will be in great competition with that of the States, and perhaps drive them out of the market. But the fact of the journey which the beasts have to undergo does deteriorate the beasts to some extent. Of course, if they have a very calm journey, and the bullocks are very quiet and tame, there is a possibility of their arriving in good condition, and I have heard of instances where they have actually gained in weight on a voyage. But, of course, the South American voyage is much longer, and at present the bullocks are much wilder; so that the American refrigerated beef, if it were classed under this Bill, would come to the front. I stated, I think, in evidence to the House of Lords, that I believed that if a number of customers were supplied with the best refrigerated beef for a given time, not knowing what they were having, and were supplied for a similar time with the best Scotch beef, they would complain more of the Scotch beef than of the refrigerated beef.

4090. Is it your decided opinion that a Bill of this sort would increase the sale of American refrigerated beef?—Yes; and I may say this from my personal acquaintance with the American centres and those engaged in the trade, that they welcome this Bill.

4091. Is that because they would be advertised?—Yes.

4092. And that it would be satisfactory in attracting public attention. Do you go so far as to say that people would begin to ask for American beef?—I do believe it. Of course, it has been sold in very large quantities for what it is.

4093. Then they would begin to be afraid of English meat being sold to them instead of American, I suppose?—A very large proportion of English beef is very inferior to what is imported.

4094. With regard to the consumer, do you think that he has been prejudiced?—I am confident on that point; I have given some reasons already, namely, as to the quality of the grass. Not only that, but the best of this imported meat, and only the best, can be sold as English, and it commands a higher price in the market than second-rate English or Irish meat; so that the consumer might be satisfied with English meat of second-rate quality, but he gets a better quality article, and is better satisfied with what he has been served with.

4095. Have you heard it alleged that foreign meat is sold to some consumers who do not know their business as English meat at English meat price?—Yes.

4096. Do you consider that that is a greater fraud, if it is a fraud, than a butcher selling inferior English meat at the best meat price?—No, no greater fraud whatever.

4097. Do you think it is as great a fraud to sell good foreign beef, which probably he makes a larger profit out of when he sells at the English price, as selling inferior English meat and yet charging good meat price?—It would be a fraud if he undertook to supply his customer with a certain thing.

4098. Supposing a customer goes into a shop and asks for beef, and foreign beef is sold to him, and he is charged the higher price, would you consider that a fraud. He is not asked about the origin, the beef is what the customer takes; it is not a fraud in any sense of the word, is it, in fact, for a man to get a higher price from his customer if he can, assuming that he makes no misrepresentation?—Quite so.

4099. It becomes of the nature of fraud much more, does it not, if he sells absolutely inferior meat and deceives his customer to that extent, and charges him the price of the best meat?—It is equally a fraud to do so.

4100. I am rather disposed to suggest whether it is not a greater fraud, whereas the other is no fraud at all where there is no misrepresentation?—Exactly so.

4101. Do you hold that the consumer practically is not prejudiced?—That is so.

4102. Do you base that upon the fact that he does not care what the origin of the meat is, so long as he gets good meat or what he considers good meat, at the price which it suits him to pay for it?—I think I have a better reason than that, and my reason is, the keen competition in the trade. If there was any such thing as combination, or if in any way we had the control of the trade in our own hands, or any combination of any kind, then you might charge us with fraud; but in my whole experience I do not know of two butchers who have ever agreed together as to the price at which they should supply their customers. Each one will endeavour, if possible, to try and undersell his neighbour, and it is the competition which prevents the fraud with which we have been charged. I do not mean to say that we are better than other classes of men, but we cannot get away from the fact of the keen competition which exists.

4103. Can you speak for other parts of the country besides London on this question?—I would rather not speak for other parts of the country. My experience of other parts of the country is just this: that the butcher there is not in a position to commit this fraud as the London butcher is, for this reason: that in the country he kills his own meat, and the different appearance of home-killed meat, as against refrigerated or imported meat, is so great that he could not sell it at all; but in London we have to make all our meat similar to the imported meat; I do myself. As soon as the meat comes home from the market it is placed in a refrigerating chamber, and from May to September it never remains in the shop for five minutes. It is placed immediately in refrigerating chambers, and is taken out as required; therefore our meat in London becomes so similar to imported meat that we should be always in trouble with the inspectors. That does not apply to the country, because they kill their own, and they could not pass off as English meat, meat that had been killed abroad.

4104. Is your argument this: that if there was a disposition to substitute foreign meat for English meat, it would be more easily done in London than it would be in the country?—Much easier. I do not see how it could be done in the country,

Chairman— continued.

country; the difference in appearance is so great.

4105. Harrod's Stores seem to sell beef under the head of "meat," and they have a separate market for American meat, the difference in price being 1*d.* ?—That is so.

4016. So that in that case the customer can choose whether he asks for American beef or beef, can he not ?—Quite so.

4107. It is assumed, is it, as they make a distinction of American beef, that the other is English beef ?—I cannot say what the customer assumes.

4108. With regard to the price list of the British Produce Supply Association, there is only one heading for beef, which they call cable brand ?—That is guaranteed all English produce.

4109. Does "Cable Brand" mean that it is all English, and guaranteed English ?—Yes.

4110. What do the Army and Navy Stores profess ? — They have two columns, home-grown and American.

4111. So that in these cases there is no question at all that they have on their price lists two classes, and the customers can choose between them ? — Quite so.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4112. Do you know if the Civil Service Stores do the same thing ?—I do not know; I have not been there. I desire further to place on record my firm conviction that, should this Bill become law, many honest and respectable men will be ruined both socially and commercially, unless in every town a court of appeal is established partly composed of practical butchers, similar to that adopted in Birmingham for many years past. Why I state that is this: The magistrate must lean to the inspector; my experience is that he does lean to the inspector; and the result of that will be that, unless practical men are placed upon some committee which shall have power to decide, a man with a good reputation (because some of us have got fair reputations) will very likely lose it, while the case is proceeding, not after the case is finished. The press will be making use of it, adjournments will take place, and a man will be ruined; he will not need to have two prosecutions to ruin a good trade.

Chairman.

4113. Do you refer to a court of appeal partly composed of practical butchers, similar to that adopted in Birmingham for many years past. What is that court ?—In Birmingham the names of 12 butchers are submitted to the council, six of whom are selected; they are placed upon a committee with the sanitary committee, and all matters referring to butchers, either to their shops or to their trade in general, or to the inspection of meat, are referred to that committee, and no action is taken until that committee have decided what action shall be taken.

4114. Is that with regard to offences under the present Acts?—That is with regard to offences under the present Acts.

4115. It gets a good court, does it, to adjudicate upon offences which are charged against

Chairman—continued.

individual butchers ?—Yes; the council select their own men, and the butchers have a representation also.

4116. Of course no question of origin comes before them at all ?—No, not at present.

4117. Do you hold that if this Bill or any Bill similar to it were to pass, the question of origin being then an offence, there would have to be a court of appeal established in order to do justice to the butchers?—I maintain that our case is prejudiced at the present moment from the fact of the way in which the public authorities are empowered to act, and the most unusual manner in which the public authorities are to give notice of this matter. I hold that we have a right to object to being singled out for this legislation without a general adoption of the principle, especially as by Clause 7 the local authorities are instructed to remind not only those who have to register, but the public generally, in a most unusual way, of the requirements of this Act. I think it goes as far as to give them instructions. It says here, "The local authority shall from time to time give public notice by advertisement in one or more newspaper or newspapers circulating in its district, and, if it thinks fit, by placard, handbills, or otherwise, of registration under this Act being required, and of the mode and time and place of such registration." I know of no other trade singled out for such legislation as that. Surely it would be sufficient that the trade itself should have notice without publicly announcing it by placards and handbills. The whole thing is bound to stigmatise the trade.

4118. You are against the Registration Clause, are you, as well as the marking ?—Decidedly.

4119. Referring to your evidence before the House of Lords, I see some reference to a House of Lords Bill and a House of Commons Bill?—Yes.

4120. Do I gather that there was some distinction between those two Bills ?—There was, but I forget it.

4121. I will read your answer, which is at page 130, Question 2598, and it will perhaps remind you: "Does your objection extend to compelling the foreign or colonial shipper to mark the goods on his side before they arrive in the London market ?—(*A.*) No, I have no objection to that." Then the question is asked, "Then the objection to the House of Commons Bills is stronger than the objection to the Bill before their Lordships' House ?" and you say, "Clearly so, because the House of Commons Bills throw upon the butcher not only the duty of marking everything, but also throw upon him the burden of proof." Do I gather from that that the House of Lords Bill did not do that ?—I think it did not.

4122. I see that you put in a draft of a Bill, and you were asked, "Have you any objection to handing in that draft Bill that was prepared by your society ?" and you say, "No; I believe your Lordship made some reference last week to having it (*the document is handed in*)," but I do not find it appears in the Appendix. Have you a copy of it?—No, I have not.

4123. What was that draft Bill ?—It came about in this way: Seven or eight of our trade

Chairman—continued.

met, I think about 16 Members of the House of Commons, one evening in one of the committee rooms, in 1893, to lay before them our views upon the subject of the Meat Market Bills, which were then before the House. Various members of our deputation addressed the Members, and finally Sir Richard Paget moved that a committee of our deputation should be appointed to confer with those Members who were bringing in the Bill to consider the whole question, and if it was thought desirable to pass such a Bill as could be worked by the trade. I had the honour of being placed on that committee with Mr. Hayden, and we met Mr. Lambert and Mr. Yerburgh, the two gentlemen who were promoting the Bills at that time. We dealt with their Bill clause by clause, with the result when we finished that they agreed they had no Bill.

4124. Then did you prepare a draft Bill?—No, I do not think we did.

4125. Then what does this reference to a draft Bill mean?—We had many conferences. I am rather disposed to think there was a Bill drafted.

4126. The question is, "Have you any objection to handing in that draft Bill that was prepared by your society?" Have you any idea what society that would mean?—It would mean our National Federation, and I could obtain the Bill.

4127. Have you no recollection of that draft Bill?—Personally I have no particular recollection of it; but I will get it for you. I should like to say that I have had prepared for me a Memorandum in reference to Clauses 3 and 4, which puts the matter in better language than I can, and I should like to be allowed to read it. It has been suggested that the marking provided for by the Bill does not apply to retail sales. As the Bill stands this suggestion appears not to be well founded. The parts of the Bill to be considered on this point are Section 3 and the schedule. Take, first, Section 3. This applies in terms to all sales, &c., of foreign meat. The words are: "Every person who sells or exposes for sale, or who hawks or offers for sale, any foreign meat." The offence is "selling," &c., "any foreign meat" "not marked on the carcases, or sides, or hams of the animals." The language of Section 3 clearly includes all sales, both wholesale and retail, and indeed the language used ("hawking," &c.) points to retail rather than wholesale transactions. The questions arising on a retail sale would be two in number, namely, Was the meat sold British or foreign? If foreign then, secondly, Was that particular piece of foreign meat marked on the carcase, or side, or ham of the animal? The difficulty of deciding question No. 1 has been pointed out by several witnesses, and is not further alluded to here, though very important, as it is hardly germane to the immediate object of this memorandum. As to question No. 2 this clearly arises in every retail transaction, no less than in wholesale transactions, though the difficulty of the question chiefly becomes apparent in retail sales. The issue whether a particular chop or steak was or was not "marked on the carcase, or side, or ham of the animal," is an issue raised by the wording of Section 3, and cannot be got rid of by any intention on the part of the framers of the Bill, or by any presumption of intention on the part of the Legislature. The difficulty can only be got over by some amendment of Clause 3. The Schedule refers to marking "carcases and other imported dead meat." Evidence has been given that some dead meat is imported in smaller pieces than carcases. That is so in a considerable number of cases. There is a great quantity of pork which comes over from Chicago, cut small, the loins. By the combined operations of Clause 3, and rules made under the wide powers of the Schedule, small pieces may be marked; if not, then extraordinary difficulties arise, as pointed out above. There is one more point I should like to be allowed to express an opinion upon, or rather to make a remark upon, because I think it is very germane to this question, namely, as to the future of our farming industry, and especially the sale of our home produce. The interest that has been taken in the breeding of cattle for many years past is considerably at fault. The show prize-winner has gone in for early maturity, and he requires a beast to be of a given weight in a given time, generally under two years of age, when it is neither veal nor beef. The result of this is that it has come into competition with cattle from America that are of mature age, and are always of uniform quality. That applies exactly to the breeder who shows at our cattle shows, but he is in the minority. A large proportion of our breeders, especially in the dairy districts of England, care nothing for the quality of the animal which they are breeding. If they get a calf, that is all that they care about, and in Ireland, I think, you will bear me out more emphatically, that is more so than in any part of England. There is a large proportion of our breeding stock which is unfit for the purpose for which it is used.

4128. How does this point bear upon the Bill?—In this way, that the imported article is very fast becoming superior to our own. Our own are deteriorating, and the other article is becoming more and more superior, with the result that unless some greater care and attention is paid to the matter, our own produce will be driven out of the market. My home is in Somersetshire, where we have large dairies, and all that is cared about there is to produce a calf, which is sold generally, and taken away when two days old.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

4129. With regard to the freezing of meat making it impossible for an inspector to tell which is which, do I understand you as to all the meat which is English which comes into the English market, it is the custom for the London butchers to put it into refrigerating chambers, because you cannot sell it unless you freeze it to make it resemble the foreign meat?—No, I said nothing about freezing. The meat has been killed for the greater part in Scotland. We get the bulk of the meat from Scotland; it has been killed

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby*—continued.

killed two days or more, and therefore it has been killed and exposed to the atmosphere as long as it ought to be, consequently we immediately have to place it in refrigerating chambers to preserve it.

4130. Is the reason for that because you cannot get it quick enough?—Exactly; it is a case of necessity; we have no slaughtering houses, we cannot kill our own meat if we want to, and, therefore, we are obliged to have what is sent from the country. Then, again, there is the question of transit; three animals could be sent dead for one alive; so that it would necessarily come dead.

4131. You said, did you not, that there would be a great danger, if marking were enforced, of smuggling going on?—I never said that. My point was this: the inspector, seeing our English and Scotch meat was so much like the other meat, would say, "This is foreign; you have it on your premises, and it has not been marked." My reason for that is, as I say, that a large quantity of foreign meat comes straight from the ship, and goes to retail shops without going through any market at all.

4132. If it all had to be marked, the place to inspect it would be at the port, would it not?—Certainly.

4133. Then your fear, with regard to that, is not very well founded, is it?—The schedule does not say when or how it is, or where marked. To my mind, the danger of this Bill is not in what it says, but in what it does not say.

4134. Have you no faith in the present inspectors?—I say the schedule of the Bill, or the carrying out of the Bill, would be left to the Board of Agriculture. I was not referring to the present inspector, and I am referring to the instructions which might be given from that Board, and the danger of the Bill is we do not know what the Board of Agriculture will decide what is to be done.

4135. I thought you alluded to some inspectors in rather derogatory terms?—The Bill provides that special men shall be appointed and remunerated accordingly.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone.*

4136. Did I understand you to say that the better class of foreign meat is very much like the English meat, and of the same quality?—I think you saw the cattle at the dead meat market.

4137. Is there much difference between the English and the best foreign meat?—None at all.

4138. When the joints are dressed do they look very much alike?—Exactly.

4139. And even an expert could hardly tell the difference?—If the beasts were killed here and hung together, no one could tell which was which, unless there was some distinguishing mark upon them.

4140. You spoke of the Army and Navy Stores; have you been there?—Yes.

4141. Did you observe whether the meat was sold at the same counter, or at different counters?—I believe at different counters.

4142. Was one counter for English meat and another for foreign meat kept separate and distinct?—Yes.

Mr. *Heywood Johnstone*—continued.

4143. And a higher price was charged and obtained for the English; is that so?—Yes.

4144. Do I understand you rightly to say that one effect of a Bill of this character would be to increase the demand for foreign meat?—Certainly.

4145. Do you say it is such a good article that people would ask for it?—Certainly, for this reason, that it does not pay to send an inferior article here, because the cost of an inferior animal would be the same as a good one.

4146. Then there being an increased amount there would be a better price, would there not?—Certainly.

4147. And that is what you meant by saying the trade would welcome it, is it?—The American trade would welcome it.

4148. Do you mean the dealer on this side would welcome it?—They are all one firm; the exporter from America keeps his representative here.

4149. Then it is the wholesale dealer, or importer, who would welcome it?—Certainly.

4150. Do you think the retail dealer would be prejudiced by it?—I do not know that he would be prejudiced by it, because the profits obtainable on that are equal to the profits obtainable on our own meat.

4151. May I take it from you that the wholesale importer would welcome the measure and the retail dealer would not be a sufferer by it?—I think not.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4152. You told the Committee, did you not, that although it is impossible to distinguish between first-class American and first-class English meat, nevertheless the consumer is willing to pay a penny a pound more for the English than for the American?—No, I never said that.

4153. Let me put my question differently. You have told us that the qualities are equally good?—Yes.

4154. Notwithstanding that fact, it is apparent the consumers will pay a penny a pound more for English than American beef, is it not?—A few will.

4155. Arising out of that answer, could you tell me the relative proportions of American and English meat that are sold in either of the three places you have mentioned?—I cannot speak of the relative proportions in the Army and Navy Stores, but at Harrod's I think I might say that there is nothing but the best American beef sold; the best American beef that is killed at Deptford or American refrigerated beef, which is sold under the name of American beef.

4156. Do I understand that at Harrod's there is no such thing as English-fed beef sold?—Rarely.

4157. Then what is the meaning of the price list?—It is not for me to say that.

4158. I notice in the Report of the House of Lords Committee, paragraph 63, under the head "Butchers' Views," this: "No objection was taken by the chairman of the London Butchers' Trade Society to the proposal to mark meat either abroad or at the port of slaughter. He thought that if

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

the trade had any objection to the meat being marked before the butchers receive it such objection must be a fancy one." Is that your case now?—I think that ought to be qualified. I cannot endorse it now, for this reason, after more fully considering the question. If you mark frozen meat with any substance such as ink, which I believe has been suggested, it must of necessity, when it thaws, expand.

4159. Do you mean run over the carcase?—Yes, run over the carcase in various points. So that I could not endorse that view now, having more fully considered the matter. That would apply to both frozen and chilled meat; as soon as the process of thawing set in it would of course become damp and the inky substance would then run over the carcase according to the quantity that there was there.

4160. Supposing that objection was got over, and that instead of having that meat marked where it was slaughtered in America or Canada, some other substance besides indelible ink which would not run, were used, or that a puncture mark were used, would that remove your objection?—I had the honour of going with the House of Lords Committee to see some practical experiments in the way of marking meat by electricity. A side of mutton was placed on the table and the wheel was run from the neck right straight down the breast down to the leg. Of course you could not injure the scragg or breast or flap of the loin, because it is almost worthless. That unfortunately for many years past has been an article which has been almost given away; but to mark a leg or to mark any part of the animal you have to penetrate the skin, and to mark a leg of mutton and so cut through the skin would be like scoring a leg of pork; the moment you put it before the fire it opens and out runs the gravy, so that the House of Lords Committee, immediately I pointed that out, discarded the idea of marking with an electric wheel. I have not at present seen any plan which can be adopted by which you can mark any portion of the animal, and so have the whole portion marked.

4161. Is your objection to marking a carcase by the electric process exactly the same as holds good with regard to frozen meat, namely, that the moment you defrost the frozen meat and cut the joint asunder, the juices of the meat begin to exude?—Certainly.

4162. And the same process would take place with electricity, would it?—No, not the same process, but owing to the fact of having broken the skin, the moment you put it to the fire, the action of the fire would be to open it, and out the gravy would come. Owing to the reason you have stated of defrosting, New Zealand mutton and lamb cannot be sold as English. Its wet and discoloured appearance is so great that 99 out of every 100 persons who came in to buy would know what they were buying.

4163. You stated, did you not, towards the end of your evidence, that we were fast falling behind in this country in the production of beef?—Decidedly.

4164. And that the present mode of carrying on agricultural shows, which conduced to the too

Mr. *Kilbride*—continued.

early development of cattle, did not tend to improve the prospects of the farmer here as a competitor with the foreigner?—Quite so; the foreigner can afford to keep his animal until it is sufficiently matured to be beef.

4165. May I take it from you that cattle under two years of age are neither veal nor beef?—That is my opinion. You cannot have the same good dark gravy out of any animal under two years of age as you can out of one of three or three and a-half years.

4166. What age do you consider that an animal should be to describe it as "beef"?—Over three years; you may have a good bull at three years old.

4167. Can you give the Committee any evidence on the relative nutritive qualities of refrigerated or frozen meat, and home-killed produce?—That must be clear. When frozen meat thaws, the juices of the animal must come away. With refrigerated meat it is not so at all; it is merely kept in a cool chamber and perfected, so that refrigerated meat must of necessity be equal, provided it is the same animal, because it has been kept sufficiently long to mature, and is perfectly fit for use.

Chairman.

4168. What is the temperature of a refrigerating chamber?—It depends on whether the process is one by machinery or by ice.

4169. What is about the average?—With ice we cannot get it below 40 degrees, and the temperature generally stands at about 44 degrees.

4170. And in the other case what do you get it at?—You would get it down possibly to almost freezing point until you stopped the machinery, and then it would gradually rise.

4171. Then it is practically no lower than in the winter months, or for six months of our year when kept in our larders?—Exactly; nothing more or less.

Mr. *Kilbride.*

4172. Do you know what the temperature of the chambers at Deptford is?—No. I have been in them; I am told that it is about 34 degrees. Of course, at Deptford the object is to do it all quickly; it must be done in one night. The major part of the beef that goes into the Deptford refrigerators remains there not more than about 24 hours.

Chairman.

4173. That would not be more than just hanging it up in an open larder in the winter, would it?—No, it does not injure the meat at all; in fact, not so much as that. Many a time in our shops we get our meat actually frozen in winter.

Mr. *Brigg.*

4174. Something has been said about the inspection of meat which arrives from abroad. Is there an inspection of all the meat which comes here, in reference to tuberculosis?—Alive or dead?

4175. I mean dead?—Of course there is a veterinary surgeon kept at Deptford. He is a veterinary surgeon paid, I believe, by the American

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

American authorities. Of course our own people have their own inspectors.

4176. So as to prevent the coming of beasts that are infected?—Quite so.

Mr. *Mildmay.*

4177. Do you admit that there is a certain amount of misrepresentation on the sale of meat?—I always have admitted that.

4178. Do you not think that the public are entitled to know what they are buying?—Yes, if they will ask. I say that we are not called upon to state what the origin of the article which we sell is, any more than a baker is called upon to state the origin of the flour which he sells.

4179. I see that in your evidence before the House of Lords you say: "In 99 cases out of 100 it is no doubt assumed that English or home-cured meat is supplied"?—Quite so, and I adhere to that statement; but if the customer will only take the trouble to compare the price at which he has been supplied with these public quotations, such as the Army and Navy and the Earl of Winchelsea's Association, he will see that he could not be supplied with that article at the price he has paid.

4180. That is all very well in big towns, where you can compare the different prices; but in comparatively small country towns what do you say?—I have stated that in small towns it can-

Mr. *Mildmay*—continued.

not occur, because the frozen meat has such a different appearance to the man's own slaughtered meat that any child could tell the difference.

4181. Could you tell the difference between meat slaughtered at the port of disembarkation and English meat?—Not at all.

4182. And in that case there could be misrepresentation, could there not?—Certainly there could.

4183. Do you not think that the public are entitled to know?—The Bill does not think so.

4184. What is your opinion?—My opinion is that they do not want to know; if they ask they certainly should be told.

4185. Do you admit that there is a possibility of considerable misrepresentation in that case?—I think that there is very little misrepresentation, because I do not think that in one case out of a thousand the question is ever raised.

4186. But still, in 99 cases out of 100, as you have said, a customer imagines that he is buying home-bred beef?—The same misrepresentation could occur there as does occur, no doubt, in a baker's shop.

4187. Two wrongs do not make a right, do they?—I agree; it is the same with the clothes I wear, made, no doubt, out of New Zealand wool, and the leather of my boots, made of American hides.

Mr. JAMES HUDSON, Senior, called in; and Examined.

Chairman.

4188. YOU are anxious, are you not, to come before this Committee and give some evidence?—Yes.

4189. Will you tell the Committee exactly what your position is?—My firm are principally retailers of cheese, bacon, and provisions, generally in the City of London and the suburbs.

4190. Are you a retailer of fresh meat?—No, not of fresh meat.

4191. Will you state what you wish to put before the Committee?—I am very much in favour of this Bill, with one exception, and I think I may say for some years past we have adopted the system of marking our goods for what they are, whether they are colonial, or foreign, or English. You may, in passing our windows, have seen that is so; and if you go into our different establishments you will find if we have any Canadian cheese it is marked "Canadian," if it is English, it is marked "English." Precisely the same with bacon or butter, which we mark with the source from which it comes.

4192. Do I understand you to say that you mark the goods with the word "Colonial?"—Yes.

4193. In the case of Canada, do you mark the produce "Canadian," and not "Colonial"?—That is so.

4194. All the other colonies do you treat as colonial?—Yes.

4195. Do you mark "English made" on your cheese?—We mark it "English," or "Irish," or "Scotch."

4196. And "Colonial" includes all except

Chairman—continued.

Canada, does it?—Yes, and Canada we mark "Canadian."

4197. Do you use the word "foreign" for everything else?—We do not use the word "foreign," although I do not know that it would not be a better term.

4198. What word do you use in reference to goods from countries not our own?—Danish, for instance, we should mark "Danish."

4199. Then you do not use the word "foreign"?—No.

4200. But in the case of what you know as produce from foreign countries, you mark it with the name of the country, do you?—Exactly; and we have found that answer exceedingly well. Some people might think that it was detrimental to sell a foreign article, but we have not found it so; and we give instructions to our managers invariably to sell a thing for what it is, upon its own merits.

4201. Where do you mark the cheese; at the top, or bottom, or on the side?—When the cheese is cut in half a ticket is put upon it, saying what it is.

4202. In the marking of the whole cheese, for instance, do you mark the side?—We do not mark the whole cheese.

4203. Do you put a ticket on it?—No. Persons purchasing a whole cheese know exactly what they are buying.

4204. Then you do not mark the whole cheese, do you?—No, but we should have no objection to do so.

Chairman—continued.

4205. With regard to butter, do you mark the case in which it is?—Yes, we mark it "Danish" or "Irish," or whatever it is.

4206. Do you carry out that practice with regard to eggs?—No, that would be almost impossible.

4207. Is the place of origin marked on bacon?—It is marked in precisely the same way, either "Irish," "English," or "Continental."

4208. The Committee have heard that in the case of Canada, all their things come marked; is that so?—They do as a rule; but I think everything should be marked "Foreign produce" rather than with the source from which it comes; because by marking it "Canadian" or "American" you are really advertising that article.

4209. Do you think that if a law was passed for marking, there should be only two designations, "British" and "Foreign"?—Just so.

4210. Would you include under the term "Foreign," the Colonies?—Yes, I think it would be better. It certainly would be a little detrimental to our Colonies, because if you mark a thing "Colonial," and it is a really good article, you get it asked for afterwards, as we find with the Canadian things.

4211. Would there be a little prejudice, could you say, against anything marked "Foreign"?—I do not think there would be on the part of the public.

4212. I rather gather that you had an idea that if it was marked Colonial there would be no prejudice, but that if it was a good article people would be disposed to buy it as much as British, on account of their sympathies with the Colonies; whereas, if it was marked "Foreign" they might rather prefer to give a turn to British articles?—I think that might be so. So that, if you marked everything "Foreign," you are really doing the Colonies a little injury, but that is a matter for consideration, I think.

4213. You do not wish of course to do the Colonies an injury, I suppose?—Certainly not. All we want is the best food at a fair price.

4214. Do you not think that it would be fair to the Colonies to mark their products "Colonial"?—Yes, I think it would on our part.

4215. Is there any other point you wish to mention?—The point of my objection to the Bill, if I know it correctly, is this: that if it purposes to mark all small quantities in our trade it would be almost an impossibility. In good neighbourhoods, where they sell in large quantities, it would not be an impossibility; but in smaller neighbourhoods, where people rush in at 12 o'clock for a rasher it would be impossible; the people would not put up with it. I think they would say "Give me that; I do not want it marked; I know what it is."

4216. Would your idea be that when the Board of Agriculture came to pass rules as to the kind of marking that was to take place with regard to cheese and bacon and other things that you are speaking of, it would be sufficient if the ham was marked and the cheese was marked, and that there would be no necessity and no practicable probability of marking the smaller portions?—That is so.

Chairman—continued.

4217. You will not give any opinion I suppose upon the dead meat?—No, I am not in a position to do that.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

4218. Is your firm the celebrated firm of Hudson Brothers?—Yes.

Mr. *Doughty.*

4219. Are you in favour of this Bill?—Yes.

4220. Do you desire to see all cheese and bacon and hams marked?—Yes, but I think they should be marked at the port of export.

4221. Do you not think that if you begin to mark bacon much more than it is marked now, it will be marked all over?—I think there should be certainly a mark upon every block of goods in one's establishment, so that a customer coming in may see at once that you have English meat, foreign meat, and Colonial meat; then you cannot be deceiving the public. There is some little difficulty, I admit, in marking a side of bacon, but it could have one mark on it.

4222. Is your reason for wishing cheese and bacon to be marked, that the public may be protected?—Just so.

4223. As a large retailer, do you think that the public at the present time are defrauded at all?—I do not think they are defrauded. I think I may say, almost universally, that is the case.

4224. Do you believe that all provision merchants, speaking generally, sell their provisions for what they are?—Yes, because they are good enough to be sold upon their own merits.

4225. If that is so, what advantage is this Bill going to be to the public?—I think it is right that the public should know what they are having. If you do not make it necessary, and one chooses to be fraudulent, it opens a door. This Bill would prevent that door being opened.

4226. If you are convinced that no one at present is being defrauded or injured, what necessity is there for the Bill?—Perhaps I am speaking more from our own point of view, but I do not like to condemn my fellow-tradesman. We do see cases in the paper of passing off foreign hams for English hams, and, perhaps, in a ham there is a greater difference than would be the case with cheese or butter. A foreign ham is frequently sold as an English one.

4227. Are you aware that the Committee have had an American ham and an Irish ham before them, and were asked to choose which was the American ham and which the Irish ham, and that I and another Member, an Irishman, made the same mistake, and chose the wrong one?—I can understand that; but that is not the case with all Canadian or American hams. Some are as fine as any Irish ham; it depends upon the feeding of the pig.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

4228. Does not that depend on when they are cooked?—I do not know, really.

Mr. *Doughty.*

4229. Do you think the marking of cheese would have any tendency to increase the price of

Mr. *Doughty*—continued.

of English-produced cheese to the consumer?—I do not think so. I do not think it would make English cheese any dearer.

4230. Do you think that the fact of English cheese being marked would make it in any greater demand?—No, I do not think so for a moment; there is such a small quantity of fine English cheese; it is only one-tenth of the make, and if you were to take the quantity of cheese exported from Canada and America, and then find during one year how much that had amounted to, and you were to take an equal amount of English cheese, because English cheese is much greater in its make than American or Canadian, you would find that the Canadian and American cheese had averaged out at a bigger price than the English. Why? An old English cheese at the present day is worth 76*s.* per cwt. This year it will be worth 10*s.* or 12*s.* less, because it was much dearer last year. But so much English cheese has to be sold at a very much less price owing to the Canadian and American cheese being better; I should think that many tons of English cheese are sold at 30*s.*, 36*s.*, and 34*s.*, whereas the average price of the Canadian and American would be, perhaps, 44*s.*, and although some English would make 76*s.* per cwt., the foreign cheese would average out at a better price all round.

4231. Is it your experience that Canadian Cheddar cheese, speaking generally, is of better quality than the average English cheeses?—Yes, certainly.

4232. And for that reason do you think it would not suffer in price?—No.

Mr. *A. H. Smith.*

4233. With regard to bacon do you say there is practically no deception?—Quite so.

4234. Are you aware that the Committee had placed before them the other day a sort of chart of the various ways that bacon is prepared in the United States, and sent over under such names as "Wiltshire cut" and "Yorkshire cut"?—I am aware that that is so.

4235. Do you not think if a side of bacon were exposed for sale under such names as that, it would be apt to mislead the public?—Certainly, and there is no right to do it.

4236. Is it not the case that this mode of preparing the bacon is specially carried out with the view to sending it to this country?—It is carried out with the view to suiting the retailer of this country, but I think the retailer has no right to say "Wiltshire cut" or "Staffordshire cut," because he is not deceived.

4237. But he misleads the public, does he?—He is misleading or deceiving the public.

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell.*

4238. Do you do much trade in the way of selling Wiltshire cuts or Yorkshire cuts?—No.

4239. Do you sell Royal Wilts, Harris' and Trowbridge?—Yes, all three are senders to us.

4240. Does all that bacon come from where it purports to come?—Yes, and they are each marked. I may say also we have a very fine brand of what we call I. D. K. bacon from Copenhagen, which is quite as fine as that bacon,

Colonel *Cotton-Jodrell*—continued.

but we should never think of selling a piece of I. D. K. bacon to a customer if he asked for Wiltshire; there is no necessity for it.

4241. I asked a witness, "The public do not come and say to you, I want so much Wiltshire cut," and he answered, "No; we never heard of such a thing; the public as a rule come out and pick out the bacon." What do you say as to that?—They come in occasionally and ask for a half-side of Denny's, a half-side of Royal Wilts, or a half-side of Harris', but that is very exceptional; as a rule they come in and ask for the best.

4242. Does not that imply great confidence in your discernment?—Yes, I have no doubt it does. I noticed yesterday in the Report of the Merchandise Marks Committee, appearing in the "Times," they said: "We believe that the consumer, generally speaking, buys the article that suits him best having regard to the price, quite irrespective of the country of origin." Now if that was in reply to a question as to dry goods, I say it is a reply to a question as to provisions also.

Mr. *MacAleese.*

4243. You would not regard it as a stigma upon you that you were compelled to mark your goods, would you?—No, I should prefer to have to mark everything.

Mr. *Brigg.*

4244. Did I understand you to say that the irregularity in the quality of the English cheese caused a great difference in the price, and that there was a greater variety in the price of English cheese than in that of foreign countries?—That is so.

4245. Does that arise from the different qualities of cheese, some of it being good and some of it being bad?—Yes.

4246. Something has been said about the British farmer not giving attention to the matter of improving the quality of the article he produces; would you say that that really was the reason why English cheese was not of a better quality?—I do not think it is the fault of the farmer altogether; in some cases it may be, but in some cases I believe it is the fault of the feed. There are some grasses that will not give you good butter and good cheeses. Why can you only make Stilton cheese in Leicestershire? Owing entirely to the kind of grass the cows feed upon, which produces that particular kind of cheese.

4247. You deal, of course, in Cheddar cheese and Cheshire cheese and Stilton cheese, do you not?—Yes.

4248. Do you buy cheese of that kind from Scotland?—We have had Cheddar cheese from Scotland; Scotch Cheddar.

4249. Have you had any Scotch Stilton?—No, I have never seen any.

4250. Nor Scotch Cheshire?—Nor Scotch Cheshire; there may be such a thing.

4251. You get Cheddar cheese from Scotland, do you?—They call it Scotch Cheddar, but we know it.

4252. Is it not the fact that a large quantity of the cheese which is sold as Cheddar, Cheshire,

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

and Stilton cheese, is not made in the counties whose names they profess to bear?—As regards Cheddar, that may be true; but as regards Stilton, and as regards Cheshire, I do not believe it. Cheshire cheese must be made in Cheshire or the immediate neighbourhood.

Chairman.

4253. There was a cheese which was popularly known at one time as Cheshire-Stilton; do you know whether it was known in the trade?—No.

Mr. *Brigg.*

4254. In justification of the question I have asked, I have seen in the Scotch dairies these various cheeses which have been made and regularly turned out and sent somewhere?—They do not come upon our market.

4255. Are you aware, also, in consequence of the extension of teaching in dairy schools, that a large variety of cheeses are made all from one whey, the milk being purchased in large quantities in the district and the whey being made from the milk, and from that whey a large variety of cheeses are produced upon the same premises?—I am not aware of that fact.

4256. Do you know that a great variety of cheeses are made from the same curds?—I do not know that.

4257. Have you bought foreign cheeses from Nottingham or Derbyshire?—No, I have never had a foreign cheese from Nottingham or Derbyshire.

4258. They are produced there, are they not, all the same?—Imitations may be.

4259. In respect to marking, did I understand you to include all goods marked "Colonial;" you spoke about foreign and English goods, but would you include Canadian cheeses and butter as not requiring a mark?—If you do not want to favour the Colonies, or Canada, or any other portions of the world, the goods should be marked "foreign," and then they are all on the same basis.

Mr. *Brigg*—continued.

4260. Do not you think that would be a means of repressing, or injuring, or lessening the trade?—I think it would be fair all round to mark everything that was not English "foreign."

4261. But you would not advise such a step in reference to the Colonies, would you?—One does not like to do that, because we have a great love for our Colonies.

4262. Strictly speaking, the interests of your trade, if you have nothing else in your mind, would lead you to recommend that every kind of goods except English should be called "foreign." Is that so?—Yes, that is so.

4263. But your moral honour is such that you would, of course, have regard to your neighbour as well as to yourself?—Quite so.

Mr. *Wingfield-Digby.*

4264. With regard to the Cheddar cheese from Scotland, would you kindly tell the Committee what part of Scotland it comes from?—Ayrshire, practically.

4265. Almost entirely from the south-west of Scotland?—Yes.

4266. Would your opinion be that the climate of the south-west of Scotland would be very much akin to the climate of Somerset and Dorset?—I should think so.

4267. And the grasses probably there would be to some extent, at any rate in the lowlands, akin to the grasses of Somerset and Dorset?—That is so.

4268. Therefore, do you think there would be some reason why the Cheddar from the south of Scotland should to some extent resemble the Cheddar which comes from the Cheddar district?—Quite so.

4269. Do you deal in filled cheese at all?—No, and I think it is a shame that such a thing should be made, because the genuine article is so cheap and good that we do not want anything of the kind. I think those things ought to be cut out altogether from coming into our country.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

APPENDIX, No. 1.

PAGE

Paper handed in by Mr. R. H. Rew, 9 July 1897 :

Table showing the Average Annual Quantity of (a) Live Meat, (b) Dead Meat, (c) Total Meat, respectively, Imported into the United Kingdom, with the Quantity per Head of Population - - 183

Table showing the Total Quantity and Value, and Value per Hundredweight and per Pound, of Meat Imported during 1896 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 183

Table showing the Total Quantity and Value, and Value per Hundredweight and per Pound, of Cheese Imported during 1896 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 184

Table showing the Average Annual Quantity of Cheese Imported into the United Kingdom, with the quantity per Head of Population - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 184

APPENDIX, No. 2.

Paper handed in by Mr. H. W. Primrose, C.B., C.S.I., 8 July 1897 :

Table No. 1.—Number of Animals Living (for Food) ; Quantities of the various kinds of Meat and Cheese registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - 185

Table No. 2.—Item (a).—Number of Oxen and Bulls registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1886, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - 185

Item (b).—Number of Cows registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - - 186

Item (c.)—Number of Calves registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - - - 186

Item (d).—Number of Sheep and Lambs registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 186

Item (e).—Number of Swine registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - - 187

Item (f).—Quantities of Beef, Fresh, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 187

Item (g).—Quantities of Mutton, Fresh, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 187

Item (h).—Quantities of Pork, Fresh, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 188

Item (i).—Quantities of Beef, Preserved, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - 188

Item (j).—Quantities of Mutton, Preserved, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - 188

Item (k).—Quantities of Beef, Salted, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 189

Item (l).—Quantities of Pork, Salted, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - 189

Item (m).—Quantities of Meat, Unenumerated, Salted or Fresh, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - 189

Item (n).—Quantities of Bacon registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - 190

Item (o).—Quantities of Hams registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - - 190

Items (p).—Quantities of Cheese registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries - - - - - - - - - - 190

Table No. 3.—Item (a).—Number of Oxen and Bulls registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - 191

Item (b).—Number of Cows registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - - 191

Item (c).—Number of Calves registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - - 192

Item (d).—Number of Sheep and Lambs registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - 192

Item (e).—Number of Swine registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - 192

Item (f).—Quantities of Beef, Fresh, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - 192

Item (g).—Quantities of Mutton, Fresh, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - 193

Item (h).—Quantities of Pork, Fresh, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - 193

Item (i).—Quantities of Beef, Preserved, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - 193

Item (j).—Quantities of Mutton, Preserved, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - 194

Item (k).—Quantities of Beef, Salted, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - 194

Item (l).—Quantities of Pork, Salted, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - 194

Item (m).—Quantities of Meat, Unenumerated, Salted or Fresh, registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports in the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - 195

Item (n).—Quantities of Bacon registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - - 195

Item (o).—Quantities of Hams registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - - 195

Item (p).—Quantities of Cheese registered as Imported into London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive - - - - - 196

Table 4.—Estimate of the Total Consumption per Head in the United Kingdom of Beef, Mutton, and Pork of all kinds, and of the Proportionate Quantities derived from Home and Foreign Sources respectively - 196

APPENDIX, No. 3.

Paper handed in by Mr. T. H. Elliott, July 1897:

Memorandum explanatory of Tables on Meat Supply - - - - - - - - - - - - - 197

Meat Supply, 1892-96.—Tables showing the Proportion per Cent. of the Approximate Estimated Quantities of Meat represented by the Home Production, by the Live Animal Imports, and by the Imports of Dead Meat, and showing the Total Proportion of each Source of Supply; with Analysis - 198

APPENDIX, No 4.

Paper handed in by Mr. H. W. Primrose, C.B., C.S.I., 8 July 1897:

Memorandum explanatory of Tables on Exports of Animals - - - - - - - - - - - - 210

Statement showing the Exports of Oxen, Bulls, Cows, and Calves bred in the United Kingdom from 1871 to 1896, showing the Number, the Declared Value, and the Average Price per Head, to the Principal Meat-exporting Countries - 210

Statement showing the Exports of Sheep and Lambs bred in the United Kingdom from 1871 to 1896, showing the Number, the Declared Value, and the Average Price per Head, to the Principal Meat-exporting Countries - 211

A P P E N D I X.

APPENDIX, No. 1.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *R. H. Rew*, 9 July 1897.

TABLE showing the Average Annual Quantity of (a) Live Meat, (b) Dead Meat, (c) Total Meat, respectively, Imported into the United Kingdom, with the Quantity per Head of Population.

Period.	Live Meat Imported.	Dead Meat Imported.	Total Importation.	Mean Population United Kingdom.	Rate per Head Imported Meat.	Rate per Head Imported Dead Meat.
	Tons.	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*No.*	*Lbs.*	*Lbs.*
1867–68–69 - -	60,300	56,500	116,800	30,692,000	8·5	4·1
1870–71–72 - -	76,500	100,000	176,500	31,563,000	12·5	7·1
1873–74–75 - -	79,700	180,100	259,800	32,506,000	17·9	12·4
1876–77–78 - -	90,400	245,900	336,300	33,573,000	22·4	16·4
1879–80–81 - -	118,100	354,900	473,000	34,620,000	30·6	23·0
1882–83–84 - -	144,100	274,700	418,800	35,459,000	26·5	17·4
1885–86–87 - -	126,700	333,200	459,900	36,308,000	28·3	20·6
1888–89–90 - -	181,100	418,600	599,700	37,179,000	36·1	25·2
1891–92–93 - -	176,900	493,200	670,100	38,115,000	39·4	28·9
1894–95–96 - -	183,900	598,900	782,800	39,125,000	44·8	34·3

TOTAL Quantity and Value, and Value per Hundredweight and per Pound, of Meat Imported during 1896.

	Quantity.	Value.		
		Total.	Per Cwt.	Per Lb.
	Cwts.	£.	£. *s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*
Bacon - - - - - - - - - - - -	4,549,526	7,854,515	1 14 6½	– 3¾
Hams - - - - - - - - - - - -	1,459,412	3,136,089	2 2 11½	– 4½
Pork - - - - - - - - - - - -	554,750	979,207	1 15 3¼	– 3¾
TOTAL Pig Meat - - -	6,563,688	11,969,811	1 16 5¾	– 4
Beef :				
Fresh - - - - - - - - - - -	2,659,700	5,028,828	1 17 9¾	– 4
Salted - - - - - - - - - - -	247,267	303,433	1 4 6½	– 2½
Preserved otherwise than by salting - - -	401,281	1,052,401	2 12 5½	– 5½
TOTAL - - -	3,308,248	6,384,662	1 18 7	– 4
Mutton :				
Fresh - - - - - - - - - - -	2,895,158	4,748,576	1 12 9½	– 3½
Preserved otherwise than by salting - - -	122,851	201,841	1 12 10¼	– 3½
TOTAL - - -	3,018,009	4,920,417	1 12 7½	– 3½
Meat unenumerated :				
Salted or fresh - - - - - - - -	279,390	554,064	1 19 8	– 4¼
Preserved otherwise than by salting - - -	177,238	519,711	2 18 7	– 6¼
TOTAL - - -	456,628	1,073,775	2 7 –¼	– 5¼

TOTAL Quantity and Value, and Value per Hundredweight and per Pound, of Cheese Imported during 1896.

	Quantity.	Value.		
		Total.	Per Cwt.	Per Lb.
Cheese:	*Cwts.*	£.	£. *s.* *d.*	*s.* *d.*
From Holland	292,988	734,611	2 10 1¾	– 5¼
„ France	45,676	139,532	3 1 1	– 6½
„ Canada	1,234,297	2,589,301	2 1 11¼	– 4½
„ United States	581,187	1,234,037	2 2 5½	– 4½
„ Other Countries	90,377	202,861	2 4 10¾	– 4½
TOTAL	2,244,525	4,900,342	2 3 8	– 4¾

Consumption per Head of Cheese (United Kingdom): *Lbs.*

Home Produce (Estimated) - 5·9

Foreign Produce (Net Imports) - 6·4

TABLE showing the Average Annual Quantity of Cheese Imported into the United Kingdom, with the Quantity per Head of Population.

Period.	Average Annual Quantity Imported.	Mean Population of United Kingdom.	Quantity per Head.
	Tons.	*No.*	*Lbs.*
1867–68–69	45,967	30,692,000	3·4
1870–71–72	52,259	31,563,000	3·9
1873–74–75	74,496	32,506,000	5·1
1876–77–78	85,899	33,573,000	5·7
1879–80–81	90,096	34,620,000	5·8
1882–83–84	90,357	35,459,000	5·7
1885–86–87	90,092	36,308,000	5·6
1888–89–90	99,496	37,179,000	6·0
1891–92–93	104,193	38,115,000	6·1
1894–95–96	110,741	39,125,000	6·3

APPENDIX, No. 2.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *H. W. Primrose*, C.B., C.S.I., 8 July 1897.

TABLE No. 1.

NUMBER of ANIMALS LIVING (for Food); Quantities of the various kinds of MEAT and CHEESE registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

Item.	ARTICLES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Animals :	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
(a)	Oxen and Bulls	490,281	337,063	471,794	413,337	558,361
(b)	Cows	10,506	2,908	3,513	1,880	3,987
(c)	Calves	1,450	74	133	348	205
(d)	Sheep and Lambs	79,048	62,682	484,597	1,065,470	769,592
(e)	Swine	3,826	138	8	321	4
	TOTAL of Animals Living	585,111	402,865	960,045	1,481,356	1,332,149
		Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
(f)	Beef, fresh	2,079,637	1,808,051	2,104,104	2,191,037	2,659,700
(g)	Mutton, fresh	1,699,966	1,971,500	2,295,066	2,611,435	2,895,158
(h)	Pork, fresh	132,107	182,091	180,383	288,284	299,411
(i)	Beef, preserved otherwise than by salting.	567,991	385,727	291,056	470,739	401,961
(j)	Mutton, preserved otherwise than by salting.	68,412	83,882	112,928	200,471	122,551
(k)	Beef, salted	275,394	200,514	242,311	219,956	247,536
(l)	Pork, salted	228,354	186,901	225,019	220,168	255,339
(m)	Meat, N. O. E., salted or fresh	150,573	177,509	189,757	237,468	279,390
(n)	Bacon	3,881,378	3,198,887	3,689,604	4,063,418	4,549,526
(o)	Hams	1,253,132	988,411	1,129,784	1,289,518	1,459,412
	TOTAL of Dead Meat of all kinds	10,336,944	9,183,473	10,460,012	11,792,494	13,169,984
(p)	Cheese	2,232,817	2,077,462	2,266,145	2,133,819	2,244,525

TABLE No. 2.

ITEM (a).

NUMBER of OXEN and BULLS registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
Portugal	924	—	—	—	—
Spain	1,591	—	—	—	—
United States of America	392,679	248,825	381,657	276,307	392,939
Argentine Republic	3,499	6,862	9,534	39,436	65,698
Canada	90,012	81,232	80,450	95,747	99,188
Other Countries	1,576	144	153	1,847	536
TOTAL	490,281	337,063	471,794	413,337	558,361

TABLE No. 2—*continued.*

ITEM (b).

NUMBER of Cows registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
Denmark	844	—	—	—	—
United States of America	255	66	265	31	169
Argentine Republic	1	20	2	54	1
Channel Islands	1,263	1,125	1,375	1,440	1,413
Canada	7,934	1,690	1,868	234	2,400
Other Countries	209	7	3	121	4
TOTAL	10,506	2,908	3,513	1,880	3,987

ITEM (c).

NUMBER of CALVES registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number*
Denmark	260	—	—	—	—
Holland	762	—	—	—	—
United States of America	7	1	10	195	11
Channel Islands	127	70	116	137	166
Canada	293	3	5	12	3
Other Countries	1	—	2	4	25
TOTAL	1,450	74	133	348	205

ITEM (d).

NUMBER of SHEEP and LAMBS registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
Norway	—	6,807	10,837	20,649	11,874
Denmark	38,529	29,227	65,439	65,046	63,293
Holland	6,686	—	—	—	—
United States of America	2,829	—	198,138	453,250	266,760
Argentine Republic	14,558	22,365	73,446	308,094	339,381
Canada	15,473	3,589	135,622	214,310	83,767
Other Countries	703	694	1,115	4,121	4,517
TOTAL	79,048	62,682	484,597	1,065,470	769,592

TABLE No. 2—*continued.*

ITEM (e).

NUMBER of SWINE registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
United States of America	2,568	—	—	191	—
Canada	1,234	137	—	128	—
Other Countries	24	1	8	2	4
TOTAL	3,826	138	8	321	4

ITEM (f).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, FRESH, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	20	56,205	18,391	6,966	1,701
United States of America	1,951,887	1,489,949	1,775,538	1,649,473	2,074,644
Argentine Republic	8,309	35,383	5,279	23,384	50,095
Victoria	—	—	—	12,421	83
New South Wales	2,568	4,200	15,090	114,166	44,941
Queensland	54,000	206,783	286,806	359,264	449,951
New Zealand	62,065	14,686	2,617	16,317	28,803
Canada	154	84	69	8,121	9,109
Other Countries	634	761	314	925	373
TOTAL	2,079,637	1,808,051	2,104,104	2,191,037	2,659,700

ITEM (g).

QUANTITIES of MUTTON, FRESH, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	2,624	2,913	3,839	4,430	5,902
Germany	22,958	17,068	7,017	6,562	3,610
Holland	164,872	197,266	199,969	167,228	229,283
Belgium	43,390	38,917	28,959	30,220	134
France	7,334	2,701	432	1,857	—
United States of America	72	117	23,121	2,964	340
Argentine Republic	471,128	515,611	585,729	715,296	801,733
South Australia	—	—	—	291	8,654
Victoria	—	32,157	91,412	124,493	104,050
New South Wales	188,671	197,995	349,536	339,337	618,091
Queensland	23,055	57,006	27,482	35,799	43,225
New Zealand	765,668	900,300	971,072	1,171,048	1,079,109
Falkland Islands	10,183	9,400	6,394	11,500	—
Other Countries	11	49	104	410	1,027
TOTAL	1,699,966	1,971,500	2,295,066	2,611,435	2,895,158

TABLE No. 2—*continued.*

ITEM (h).

QUANTITIES of PORK, FRESH, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	3,793	4,330	2,015	904	2,164
Holland	92,808	120,147	133,526	245,726	244,344
Belgium	22,522	25,246	30,585	27,150	39,208
France	4,626	25,556	8,679	3	3,642
United States of America	6,409	2,191	4,339	13,506	8,638
Argentine Republic	1,392	3,868	551	339	743
Other Countries	557	753	688	656	672
TOTAL	132,107	182,091	180,383	288,284	299,411

ITEM (i).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, PRESERVED, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Germany	845	336	470	5,483	628
Belgium	5,405	5,605	6,185	6,745	6,549
France	3,247	235	386	1,911	505
United States of America	360,180	286,310	205,485	253,261	209,784
Uruguay	29,501	18,812	2,473	10,136	1,557
Argentine Republic	104,012	7,075	1,232	12,213	12,199
New South Wales	27,348	30,776	30,866	65,615	40,663
Queensland	25,312	31,203	38,776	104,341	99,012
New Zealand	5,617	634	331	355	2,065
Canada	4,846	2,475	3,672	9,379	26,619
Other Countries	1,678	2,266	1,180	1,300	2,380
TOTAL	567,991	385,727	291,056	470,739	401,961

ITEM (j).

QUANTITIES of MUTTON, PRESERVED, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
United States of America	720	2,014	3,626	5,260	3,636
Argentine Republic	3,880	2,266	1,347	1,876	2,414
Victoria	59	360	1,115	3,404	5,798
New South Wales	43,227	63,323	80,961	143,401	65,144
Queensland	7,744	5,445	12,182	18,571	23,216
New Zealand	9,325	9,012	12,264	25,339	19,754
Canada	3,203	1,406	1,258	692	930
Other Countries	254	56	175	1,928	1,659
TOTAL	68,412	83,882	112,928	200,471	122,551

TABLE No. 2—*continued.*

ITEM (k).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, SALTED, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
United States of America	267,709	187,927	235,120	212,048	240,630
Canada	4,513	7,236	2,729	2,150	5,999
Other Countries	3,172	5,351	4,462	5,758	907
TOTAL	275,394	200,514	242,311	219,956	247,536

ITEM (l).

QUANTITIES of PORK, SALTED, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	58,269	66,865	61,360	78,131	88,070
United States of America	162,220	110,800	150,186	122,902	137,673
Canada	3,358	2,287	7,702	12,545	16,643
Other Countries	4,507	6,949	5,771	6,590	12,953
TOTAL	228,354	186,901	225,019	220,168	255,339

ITEM (m).

QUANTITIES of MEAT, UNENUMERATED, SALTED or FRESH, registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	8,665	14,580	14,424	13,527	16,786
Holland	100,233	110.865	109,331	151,117	163,277
Belgium	5,129	9,887	6,448	8,029	2,532
France	8,909	9,166	8,272	9,005	12,777
United States of America	20,895	21,865	34,315	37,301	60,610
Argentine Republic	2,361	3,916	4,381	7,065	13,228
New South Wales	166	801	1,832	1,406	1,701
Queensland	790	2,296	5,386	1,361	523
New Zealand	1,347	1,828	2,916	3,814	3,640
Canada	653	1,099	671	1,501	2,325
Other Countries	1,425	1,206	1,781	3,342	1,991
TOTAL	150,573	177,509	189,757	237,468	279,390

TABLE No. 2—*continued.*

ITEM (n).

QUANTITIES of BACON registered as Imported into the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Russia	9,756	16,823	9,902	13,954	19,001
Sweden	51,121	62,339	72,541	96,385	76,317
Denmark	671,882	711,854	766,828	1,013,930	1,222,114
Germany	3,089	9,744	339	282	512
Holland	8,886	24,639	23,666	17,923	22,651
United States of America	2,895,951	2,177,293	2,561,203	2,649,482	2,751,518
Canada	239,121	193,773	254,443	268,886	456,723
Other Countries	1,572	2,422	682	2,576	690
TOTAL	3,881,378	3,198,887	3,689,604	4,063,418	4,549,526

ITEM (o).

QUANTITIES of HAMS registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Denmark	4,000	7,270	1,785	1,825	1,947
Germany	1,926	1,446	1,520	1,118	1,252
United States of America	1,131,279	920,961	1,075,270	1,203,157	1,285,976
Canada	114,198	57,780	50,576	81,707	169,276
Other Countries	1,729	954	633	1,711	961
TOTAL	1,253,132	988,411	1,129,784	1,289,518	1,459,412

ITEM (p).

QUANTITIES of CHEESE registered as Imported into the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive, showing the Principal Countries.

COUNTRIES.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
Holland	273,821	269,364	298,693	305,920	292,988
Belgium	26,039	15,829	35,946	21,543	31,287
France	45,605	58,346	52,969	56,393	45,676
United States of America	818,433	645,235	672,347	500,419	581,187
New Zealand	25,583	37,043	45,398	74,894	55,095
Canada	1,038,599	1.046,704	1,142,104	1,150,018	1,234,297
Other Countries	4,737	4,942	18,688	24,632	3,995
TOTAL	2,232,817	2,077,462	2,266,145	2,133,819	2,244,525

TABLE No. 3.

ITEM (a).

NUMBER of OXEN and BULLS registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
London	144,935	116,704	175,098	150,410	211,108
Liverpool	227,562	163,006	217,012	198,070	253,957
Glasgow	72,825	47,015	54,698	49,899	68,307
Bristol	16,213	5,687	15,830	9,054	14,302
Other Ports	28,746	4,651	9,156	5,904	10,687
TOTAL	490,281	337,063	471,794	413,337	558,361

ITEM (b).

NUMBER of Cows registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
London	660	359	90	318	432
Liverpool	1,544	1,164	1,529	29	9
Glasgow	1,062	169	229	74	114
Bristol	760	—	27	2	2,004
Southampton	978	875	1,195	1,317	1,331
Aberdeen	1,180	—	—	—	—
Dundee	1,612	2	—	—	—
Other Ports	2,710	339	443	140	97
TOTAL	10,506	2,908	3,513	1,880	3,987

ITEM (c).

NUMBER of CALVES registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
London	694	—	2	13	27
Liverpool	221	3	10	170	10
Glasgow	19	1	3	26	—
Southampton	80	49	92	125	158
Other Ports	436	21	26	14	10
TOTAL	1,450	74	133	348	205

TABLE No. 3—*continued.*

ITEM (d).

NUMBER of SHEEP and LAMBS registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
London	9,079	10,587	135,530	364,341	284,437
Liverpool	42,359	22,575	199,135	495,007	353,503
Glasgow	105	—	33,788	77,693	40,289
Bristol	1,052	107	38,220	40,413	11,969
Newcastle	25,883	22,606	50,362	45,565	56,907
Leith	—	6,807	20,930	31,176	13,590
Other Ports	570	—	6,632	11,275	8,897
TOTAL	79,048	62,682	484,597	1,065,470	769,592

ITEM (e).

NUMBER of SWINE registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895	1896.
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*
London	147	—	—	2	4
Liverpool	1,087	137	8	132	—
Glasgow	—	—	—	187	—
Hull	2,568	—	—	—	—
Other Ports	24	1	—	—	—
TOTAL	3,826	138	8	321	4

ITEM (f).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, FRESH, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	312,235	376,434	517,794	755,445	810,130
Liverpool	1,574,452	1,163,493	1,335,117	1,232,859	1,607,737
Glasgow	97,609	43,579	25,128	7,546	8,675
Bristol	83,458	27,676	24,231	4	—
Harwich	—	45,848	16,204	6,842	1,554
Southampton	448	140,534	183,303	183,223	223,039
Other Ports	11,435	10,487	2,327	5,118	8,565
TOTAL	2,079,637	1,808,051	2,104,104	2,191,037	2,659,700

TABLE No. 3—*continued.*

ITEM (g).

QUANTITIES of MUTTON, FRESH, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	1,058,066	1,264,459	1,561,380	1,786,092	1,981,591
Liverpool	441,079	488,759	519,279	615,141	649,766
Glasgow	3,144	2,150	1,332	523	8
Cardiff	—	—	16,120	45,211	49,383
Harwich	180,575	199,014	191,373	156,651	181,941
Manchester	—	—	—	6,200	28,684
Other Ports	17,102	17,118	5,582	1,617	3,785
TOTAL	1,699,966	1,971,500	2,295,066	2,611,435	2,895,158

ITEM (h).

QUANTITIES of PORK, FRESH, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	36,360	47,042	61,959	99,652	149,152
Liverpool	4,981	4,642	2,653	11,805	7,925
Glasgow	1,430	—	180	1,618	781
Harwich	83,937	102,881	104,825	174,767	137,405
Southampton	4,331	24,912	9,892	360	3,405
Other Ports	1,068	2,614	874	82	743
TOTAL	132,107	182,091	180,383	288,284	299,411

ITEM (i).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, PRESERVED, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	193,233	149,055	120,044	252,387	211,463
Liverpool	226,654	95,555	61,970	88,486	76,086
Glasgow	33,876	55,651	40,091	38,723	33,756
Bristol	51,117	30,351	24,944	21,787	23,377
Hull	28,750	22,628	20,024	22,320	21,186
Manchester	—	—	1,150	9,149	12,478
Newcastle	24,550	20,330	13,932	24,626	8,550
Other Ports	9,811	12,147	8,901	13,261	12,065
TOTAL	567,991	385,727	291,056	470,739	401,961

TABLE No. 3—*continued.*

ITEM (j).

QUANTITIES of MUTTON, PRESERVED, otherwise than by Salting, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	59,851	79,013	108,501	194,048	117,074
Liverpool	6,710	3,704	3,948	4,738	3,554
Glasgow	300	974	375	1,473	392
Manchester	—	—	—	—	890
Other Ports	1,551	191	104	212	641
TOTAL	68,412	83,882	112,928	200,471	122,551

ITEM (k).

QUANTITIES of BEEF, SALTED, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	34,326	31,074	28,821	27,428	29,213
Liverpool	115,814	88,630	107,253	90,788	112,045
Glasgow	79,662	53,131	59,557	49,963	49,691
Hull	27,399	14,603	31,155	39,422	41,657
Other Ports	18,193	13,076	15,525	12,355	14,930
TOTAL	275,394	200,514	242,311	219,956	247,536

ITEM (l).

QUANTITIES of PORK, SALTED, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom, in each year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	38,298	27,741	33,703	31,949	29,347
Liverpool	118,312	86,073	115,363	99,574	106,023
Glasgow	12,667	7,225	8,362	7,158	7,323
Hull	8,669	4,818	11,283	14,044	27,069
Newcastle	22,553	32,512	22,246	23,519	32,000
Leith	23,341	24,669	30,132	39,916	41,992
Other Ports	4,514	3,863	3,930	4,008	11,585
TOTAL	228,354	186,901	225,019	220,168	255,339

TABLE No. 3—*continued.*

ITEM (m)

QUANTITIES of MEAT, UNENUMERATED, SALTED OR FRESH, registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports in the United Kingdom, in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	35,522	41,477	53,260	76,794	83,405
Liverpool	21,969	18,778	33,963	40,855	69,711
Glasgow	259	664	808	748	1,043
Dover	5,327	6,793	6,547	7,550	8,109
Grimsby	3,091	8,454	8,257	6,199	8,656
Harwich	71,388	83,167	75,596	93,011	94,415
Hull	6,785	8,106	6,806	9,236	7,460
Other Ports	6,232	10,070	4,520	3,075	6,591
TOTAL	150,573	177,509	189,757	237,468	279,390

ITEM (n).

QUANTITIES of BACON registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	239,956	195,595	221,155	268,190	224,547
Liverpool	2,339,623	1,895,866	2,123,494	2,176,143	2,224,412
Glasgow	135,266	96,111	118,173	139,405	126,510
Bristol	141,514	93,082	139,055	106,139	145,270
Harwich	486,959	531,514	588,180	789,734	935,611
Hull	415,527	234.810	313,322	344,724	600,897
Newcastle	73,597	87,946	71,743	98,471	102,646
Southampton	—	16,269	69,912	88,886	129,872
Other Ports	48,936	47,694	44,570	51,726	59,761
TOTAL	3,881,378	3,198,887	3,689,604	4,063,418	4,549,526

ITEM (o).

QUANTITIES of HAMS registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	64,440	22,992	38,480	93,594	126,785
Liverpool	881,208	755,975	849,478	955,235	1,058,758
Glasgow	202,023	139,219	157,149	166,871	207,764
Bristol	36,541	16,068	17,388	22,672	20,518
Hull	58,018	34,448	48,378	27,373	24,396
Southampton	51	7,070	8,900	12,167	11,419
Other Ports	10,851	12,639	10,011	11,606	9,772
TOTAL	1,253,132	988,411	1,129,784	1,289,518	1,459,412

TABLE No. 3—*continued.*

ITEM (p).

QUANTITIES of CHEESE registered as Imported into *London*, *Liverpool*, *Glasgow*, and other Principal Ports of the United Kingdom in each Year from 1892 to 1896, inclusive.

PORTS.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
	Cwts.	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*	*Cwts.*
London	720,671	622,548	757,827	749,032	792,482
Liverpool	711,482	614,373	628,425	604,111	615,373
Glasgow	144,587	128,659	120,496	103,349	89,708
Bristol	330,529	326,283	359,064	294,629	389,888
Harwich	82,000	67,658	93,365	82,071	85,435
Hull	48,664	45,968	60,766	45,576	34,763
Newhaven	37,009	50,529	47,058	49,813	38,933
Southampton	19,739	90,809	64,220	52,531	56,302
Leith	62,397	65,264	68,196	75,296	64,783
Other Ports	75,739	65,371	66,728	77,411	76,858
TOTAL	2,232,817	2,077,462	2,266,145	2,133,819	2,244,525

TABLE No. 4.

ESTIMATE of the Total Consumption per Head in the United Kingdom of Beef, Mutton, and Pork of all kinds, and of the Proportionate Quantities derived from Home and Foreign Sources respectively.

	Consumption per Head of Population in 1896.
	Lbs.
Fresh meat of Home origin	58
Fresh meat of Foreign or Colonial origin (imported alive)	12
Fresh meat of Foreign or Colonial origin (imported dead)	16
Bacon, ham, and salt meat imported	20
Bacon, ham, and pork of Home origin	15
TOTAL	122

The above estimate is necessarily based largely on hypothesis, so far as meat of Home origin is concerned; but it is offered as a convenient way of presenting at a glance the proportions in which we rely for our meat supply on Home and Foreign sources respectively.

Board of Customs,
14 July 1897.

H. W. Primrose.

APPENDIX, No. 3.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *T. H. Elliott*, C.B., July 1897.

MEAT SUPPLY.—1892-96.

MEMORANDUM EXPLANATORY OF TABLES ON MEAT SUPPLY.

CERTAIN estimates have been made in the Office of the Board of Agriculture showing approximately the respective proportions of the foreigh imports, either of live animals or of dead meat, and of the home production of meat. As regards home production, the method employed has been to take the number of cattle, sheep, and swine, of all ages, existing in the United Kingdom in the middle of the year, as shown in the annual Agricultural Returns, and to deduce therefrom the weight of butcher's meat produced in one year. This can be approximately calculated by a formula which has been in general use with no material fluctuations since it was first adopted in 1871. It is assumed that, for every 1,000 living cattle of all ages, about 67 tons of beef, or veal, are available in a year; for every 1,000 living sheep enumerated, 12½ tons of mutton or lamb; and for every 1,000 living pigs, 69½ tons of bacon, ham, or pork. On this basis the estimated available home production of meat in 1892 was given to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Marking of Foreign Meat as including 771,000 tons of beef and veal, 421,000 tons of mutton and lamb, and 227,000 tons of pig-meat (all forms), or a total of 1,419,000 tons, of the entire production of this country. Similar figures for each subsequent year have now been prepared and are printed for comparison with 1892, in the accompanying tables.

The data for meat obtained from live imports and for imported dead meat are likewise given in these tables. The supply of dead meat represented by imported live animals has been calculated upon the average weight of meat represented by each description of animal imported from the countries whence we derive supplies, and the quantities of dead meat imported in each year, consisting in part of fresh meat, in part of salted meat, and in part of preserved (*i.e.*, mainly tinned) meat, have been taken from the records kept by Her Majesty's Customs.

The tables are prefaced by a series of percentages for each class of meat in each of the five years and for the average of these years.

T. H. E.

July 1897.

MEAT SUPPLY.—1892-96.

PROPORTION per Cent. of the Approximate Estimated Quantities of Meat represented by the Home Production, by the Live Animal Imports, and by the Imports of Dead Meat, showing the Total Proportion of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.	Proportion per Cent.					
	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	Yearly Average, 1892–96.
Home Production:						
Beef and Veal	36·4	38·3	34·8	33·4	31·9	34·9
Mutton and Lamb	19·8	20·3	18·1	17·3	16·8	18·5
Pig-meat of all forms	10·7	11·6	12·7	13·6	13·0	12·3
TOTAL	66·9	70·2	65·6	64·3	61·7	65·7
Live Imports:						
Beef and Veal	8·3	6·0	8·0	6·5	8·3	7·4
Mutton and Lamb	0·1	0·1	0·7	1·4	1·0	0·7
Pig-meat (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	8·4	6·1	8·7	7·9	9·3	8·1
Imports of Dead Meat:						
Beef — Fresh	4·9	4·6	5·1	5·1	5·8	5·1
Beef — Salted	0·7	0·5	0·6	0·5	0·5	0·6
Beef — Otherwise preserved	1·3	1·0	0·7	1·1	0·9	1·0
TOTAL Beef	6·9	6·1	6·4	6·7	7·2	6·7
Mutton — Fresh	4·0	5·0	5·5	6·0	6·3	5·3
Mutton — Preserved	0·2	0·2	0·3	0·5	0·2	0·3
TOTAL Mutton	4·2	5·2	5·8	6·5	6·5	5·6
Pork — Fresh	0·3	0·5	0·4	0·7	0·7	0·5
Pork — Salted	0·5	0·5	0·6	0·5	0·5	0·5
Bacon	9·1	8·1	9·0	9·4	9·9	9·1
Hams	3·0	2·5	2·7	3·0	3·2	2·9
TOTAL Pig-meat	12·9	11·6	12·7	13·6	14·3	13·0
Unenumerated — Salted or fresh	0·3	0·5	0·4	0·6	0·6	0·5
Unenumerated — Preserved otherwise	0·4	0·3	0·4	0·4	0·4	0·4
TOTAL Unenumerated	0·7	0·8	0·8	1·0	1·0	0·9
TOTAL OF DEAD MEAT	24·7	23·7	25·7	27·8	29·0	26·2
GRAND TOTAL OF MEAT SUPPLY	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1892-96—*continued.*

PROPORTION per Cent. of the Approximate Estimated Quantities of Meat represented by the Home Production, by the Live Animal Imports, and by the Imports of Dead Meat, showing the Total Proportion of the Supply of each kind of Meat.

DESCRIPTION.	Proportion per Cent.					
	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	Average.
Beef and Veal:						
Home Production	36·4	38·3	34·8	33·4	31·9	34·9
Live Imports	8·3	6·0	8·0	6·5	8·3	7·4
Imports of Dead Meat	6·9	6·1	6·4	6·7	7·2	6·7
TOTAL Beef	51·6	50·4	49·2	46·6	47·4	49·0
Mutton and Lamb:						
Home Production	19·8	20·3	18·1	17·3	16·8	18·5
Live Imports	0·1	0·1	0·7	1·4	1·0	0·7
Imports of Dead Meat	4·2	5·2	5·8	6·5	6·5	5·6
TOTAL Mutton	24·1	25·6	24·6	25·2	24·3	24·8
Pig-meat:						
Home Production	10·7	11·6	12·7	13·6	13·0	12·3
Live Imports (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	12·9	11·6	12·7	13·6	14·3	13·0
TOTAL Pig-meat	23·6	23·2	25·4	27·2	27·3	25·3
Unenumerated	0·7	0·8	0·8	1·0	1·0	0·9
GRAND TOTAL	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1892.

APPROXIMATE ESTIMATE of the Meat represented by the Home Production and by the Live Animal Imports, together with the Imports of Dead Meat; showing also the Proportion per Cent. of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.			Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Home Production:					
Beef and Veal			771,000	—	36·4
Mutton and Lamb			421,000	—	19·8
Pig-meat of all forms			227,000	—	10·7
	TOTAL		—	1,419,000	66·9
Produce of Live Imports:					
Beef and Veal			176,000	—	8·3
Mutton and Lamb			2,000	—	0·1
Pig-meat			*	—	—
	TOTAL		—	178,000	8·4
Imports of Dead Meat:					
Beef	Fresh	104,000	—	—	4·9
	Salted	14,000	—	—	0·7
	Otherwise preserved	28,000	—	—	1·3
	TOTAL Beef		146,000	—	6·9
Mutton	Fresh	85,000	—	—	4·0
	Preserved	3,000	—	—	0·2
	TOTAL Mutton		88,000	—	4·2
Pork	Fresh	7,000	—	—	0·3
	Salted	11,000	—	—	0·5
Bacon		194,000	—	—	9·1
Hams		63,000	—	—	3·0
	TOTAL Pig-meat		275,000	—	12·9
Unenumerated	Salted or fresh	7,000	—	—	0·3
	Preserved otherwise	9,000	—	—	0·4
	TOTAL Unenumerated		16,000	—	0·7
	TOTAL DEAD MEAT		—	525,000	24·7
	GRAND TOTAL OF MEAT SUPPLY		—	2,122,000	100·0

* Less than 200 tons.

MEAT SUPPLY, 1892—*continued.*

ANALYSIS of the Estimated Meat Supply from all Sources, distinguishing the Proportion of Beef, Mutton, and Pig-meat respectively.

DESCRIPTION.	Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Beef and Veal:			
Home Production	771,000	—	36·4
Live Imports	176,000	—	8·3
Imports of Dead Meat	146,000	—	6·9
TOTAL Beef	—	1,093,000	51·6
Mutton and Lamb:			
Home Production	421,000	—	19·8
Live Imports	2,000	—	0·1
Imports of Dead Meat	88,000	—	4·2
TOTAL Mutton	—	511,000	24·1
Pig-meat:			
Home Production	227,000	—	10·7
Live Imports	*	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	275,000	—	12·9
TOTAL Pig-meat	—	502,000	23·6
Unenumerated	—	16,000	0·7
GRAND TOTAL	—	2,122,000	100·0

* Less than 200 tons.

MEAT SUPPLY, 1893.

APPROXIMATE ESTIMATE of the Meat represented by the Home Production and by the Live Animal Imports, together with the Imports of Dead Meat; showing also the Proportion per Cent. of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.			Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Home Production:					
Beef and Veal			751,000	—	38·3
Mutton and Lamb			397,000	—	20·3
Pig-meat of all forms			227,000	—	11·6
TOTAL			—	1,375,000	70·2
Live Imports:					
Beef and Veal			118,000	—	6·0
Mutton and Lamb			2,000	—	0·1
Pig-meat (Importation insignificant)			—	—	—
TOTAL			—	120,000	6·1
Imports of Dead Meat:					
Beef	Fresh	90,000	—	—	4·6
	Salted	10,000	—	—	0·5
	Otherwise preserved	19,000	—	—	1·0
TOTAL Beef			119,000	—	6·1
Mutton	Fresh	99,000	—	—	5·0
	Preserved	4,000	—	—	0·2
TOTAL Mutton			103,000	—	5·2
Pork	Fresh	9,000	—	—	0·5
	Salted	9,000	—	—	0·5
Bacon		160,000	—	—	8·1
Hams		50,000	—	—	2·5
TOTAL Pig-meat			228,000	—	11·6
Unenumerated	Salted or Fresh	9,000	—	—	0·5
	Preserved otherwise	6,000	—	—	0·3
TOTAL Unenumerated			15,000	—	0·8
TOTAL OF DEAD MEAT			—	465,000	23·7
GRAND TOTAL OF MEAT SUPPLY			—	1,960,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1893—*continued.*

ANALYSIS of the Estimated Meat Supply from all Sources, distinguishing the Proportion of Beef, Mutton, and Pig-meat, respectively.

DESCRIPTION.	Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Beef and Veal:			
Home Production	751,000	—	38·3
Live Imports	118,000	—	6·0
Imports of Dead Meat	119,000	—	6·1
TOTAL Beef	—	988,000	50·4
Mutton and Lamb:			
Home Production	397,000	—	20·3
Live Imports	2,000	—	0·1
Imports of Dead Meat	103,000	—	5·2
TOTAL Mutton	—	502,000	25·6
Pig-meat:			
Home Production	227,000	—	11·6
Live Imports (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	228,000	—	11 6
TOTAL Pig-meat	—	455,000	23·2
Unenumerated	—	15,000	0·8
GRAND TOTAL	—	1,960,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1894.

APPROXIMATE ESTIMATE of the Meat represented by the Home Production, and by the Live Animal Imports, together with the Imports of Dead Meat; showing also the Proportion per cent. of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.		Quantities. Tons (in round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Home Production:				
Beef and Veal		722,000	—	34·8
Mutton and Lamb		376,000	—	18·1
Pig-meat of all forms		263,000	—	12·7
TOTAL		—	1,361,000	65·6
Live Imports;				
Beef and Veal		166,000	—	8·0
Mutton and Lamb		14,000	—	0·7
Pig-meat (importation insignificant)		—	—	—
TOTAL		—	180,000	8·7
Imports of Dead Meat:				
Beef — Fresh	105,000	—	—	5·1
Beef — Salted	12,000	—	—	0·6
Beef — Otherwise preserved	15,000	—	—	0·7
TOTAL Beef		132,000	—	6·4
Mutton — Fresh	115,000	—	—	5·5
Mutton — Preserved	5,000	—	—	0·3
TOTAL Mutton		120,000	—	5·8
Pork — Fresh	9,000	—	—	0·4
Pork — Salted	11,000	—	—	0·6
Bacon	186,000	—	—	9·0
Hams	57,000	—	—	2·7
TOTAL Pig-meat		263,000	—	12·7
Unenumerated — Salted or fresh	9,000	—	—	0·4
Unenumerated — Preserved otherwise	8,000	—	—	0·4
TOTAL Unenumerated		17,000	—	0·8
TOTAL of Dead Meat		—	532,000	25·7
GRAND TOTAL of MEAT SUPPLY		—	2,073,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1894—*continued.*

ANALYSIS of the Estimated Meat Supply from all Sources, distinguishing the Proportion of Beef, Mutton, and Pig-meat respectively.

DESCRIPTION.	Quantities. Tons (in round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Beef and Veal :			
Home Production	722,000	—	34·8
Live Imports	166,000	—	8·0
Imports of Dead Meat	132,000	—	6·4
TOTAL Beef	—	1,020,000	49·2
Mutton and Lamb :			
Home Production	376,000	—	18·1
Live Imports	14,000	—	0·7
Imports of Dead Meat	120,000	—	5·8
TOTAL Mutton	—	510,000	24·6
Pig-meat :			
Home Production	263,000	—	12·7
Live Imports (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	263,000	—	12·7
TOTAL Pig-meat	—	526,000	25·4
Unenumerated	—	17,000	0·8
GRAND TOTAL	—	2,073,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1895.

APPROXIMATE ESTIMATE of the Meat represented by the Home Production and by the Live Animal Imports, together with the Imports of Dead Meat; showing also the Proportion per Cent. of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.		Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Home Production:				
Beef and Veal		720,000	—	33·4
Mutton and Lamb		372,000	—	17·3
Pig-meat of all forms		294,000	—	13·6
TOTAL		—	1,386,000	64·3
Live Imports:				
Beef and Veal		141,000	—	6·5
Mutton and Lamb		30,000	—	1·4
Pig-meat (importation insignificant)		—	—	—
TOTAL		—	171,000	7·9
Imports of Dead Meat:				
Beef - Fresh	109,000	—	—	5·1
Beef - Salted	11,000	—	—	0·5
Beef - Otherwise preserved	24,000	—	—	1·1
TOTAL Beef		144,000	—	6·7
Mutton - Fresh	131,000	—	—	6·0
Mutton - Preserved	10,000	—	—	0·5
TOTAL Mutton		141,000	—	6·5
Pork - Fresh	14,000	—	—	0·7
Pork - Salted	11,000	—	—	0·5
Bacon	203,000	—	—	9·4
Hams	65,000	—	—	3·0
TOTAL Pig-meat		293,000	—	13·6
Unenumerated - Salted or Fresh	12,000	—	—	0·6
Unenumerated - Preserved otherwise	9,000	—	—	0·4
TOTAL Unenumerated		21,000	—	1·0
TOTAL of DEAD MEAT		—	599,000	27·8
GRAND TOTAL OF MEAT SUPPLY		—	2,156,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1895—*continued.*

ANALYSIS of the Estimated Meat Supply from all Sources, distinguishing the Proportion of Beef, Mutton, and Pig-meat, respectively.

DESCRIPTION.	Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Beef and Veal :			
Home Production	720,000	—	33·4
Live Imports	141,000	—	6·5
Imports of Dead Meat	144,000	—	6·7
TOTAL Beef	—	1,005,000	46·6
Mutton and Lamb :			
Home Production	372,000	—	17·3
Live Imports	30,000	—	1·4
Imports of Dead Meat	141,000	—	6·5
TOTAL Mutton	—	543,000	25·2
Pig-meat :			
Home Production	294,000	—	13·6
Live Imports (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	293,000	—	13·6
TOTAL Pig-meat	—	587,000	27·2
Unenumerated	—	21,000	1·0
GRAND TOTAL	—	2,156,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1896.

APPROXIMATE ESTIMATE of the Meat represented by the Home Production and by the Live Animal Imports, together with the Imports of Dead Meat: showing also the Proportion per Cent. of each Source of Supply.

DESCRIPTION.		Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Home Production:				
Beef and Veal		733,000	—	31·9
Mutton and Lamb		386,000	—	16·8
Pig-meat of all forms		298,000	—	13·0
TOTAL		—	1,417,000	61·7
Live Imports:				
Beef and Veal		191,000	—	8·3
Mutton and Lamb		22,000	—	1·0
Pig-meat (Importation insignificant)		—	—	—
TOTAL		—	213,000	9·3
Imports of Dead Meat:				
Beef — Fresh	133,000	—	—	5·8
Beef — Salted	12,000	—	—	0·5
Beef — Otherwise preserved	20,000	—	—	0·9
TOTAL Beef		165,000	—	7·2
Mutton — Fresh	145,000	—	—	6·3
Mutton — Preserved	6,000	—	—	0·2
TOTAL Mutton		151,000	—	6·5
Pork — Fresh	15,000	—	—	0·7
Pork — Salted	13,000	—	—	0·5
Bacon	227,000	—	—	9·9
Hams	73,000	—	—	3·2
TOTAL Pig-meat		328,000	—	14·3
Unenumerated — Salted or Fresh	14,000	—	—	0·6
Unenumerated — Preserved otherwise	9,000	—	—	0·4
TOTAL Unenumerated		23,000	—	1·0
TOTAL of DEAD MEAT		—	667,000	29·0
GRAND TOTAL OF MEAT SUPPLY		—	2,297,000	100·0

MEAT SUPPLY, 1896—*continued.*

ANALYSIS of the Estimated Meat Supply from all Sources, distinguishing the Proportion of Beef, Mutton, and Pig-meat, respectively.

DESCRIPTION.	Quantities. Tons (in Round Numbers).		Proportion per Cent.
Beef and Veal:			
Home Production	733,000	—	31·9
Live Imports	191,000	—	8·3
Imports of Dead Meat	165,000	—	7·2
TOTAL Beef	—	1,089,000	47·4
Mutton and Lamb:			
Home Production	386,000	—	16·8
Live Imports	22,000	—	1·0
Imports of Dead Meat	151,000	—	6·5
TOTAL Mutton	—	559,000	24·3
Pig-meat:			
Home Production	298,000	—	13·0
Live Imports (Importation insignificant)	—	—	—
Imports of Dead Meat	328,000	—	14·3
TOTAL Pig-meat	—	626,000	27·3
Unenumerated	—	23,000	1·0
GRAND TOTAL	—	2,297,000	100·0

Board of Agriculture, 4, Whitehall-place, S.W.,
July 1897.

APPENDIX, No. 4.

PAPER handed in by Mr. *H. W. Primrose*, C.B., C.S.I., 8 July 1897.

MEMORANDUM EXPLANATORY OF TABLES ON EXPORTS OF ANIMALS.

THE following Returns are for the purpose of showing the high value of the animals exported during 26 years to those countries from which we now derive the large supplies of foreign meat. The animals of all kinds were exported for breeding purposes, for effecting improvements in the quality of the animals produced in those countries, and the high value of the bulls, rams, &c., sent out may help to explain the confidence felt by the importers of foreign meat as to the power of such meat to hold its own, in the markets of this country, against second-class home-bred meat.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

STATEMENT showing the Exports of OXEN, BULLS, COWS, and CALVES bred in the United Kingdom from 1871 to 1896, showing the Number, the Declared Value, and the Average Price per Head, to the principal Meat-exporting Countries.

OXEN AND BULLS, COWS AND CALVES.

EXPORTED TO	1871.			1872.			1873.			1874.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	129	11,775	91·28	65	7,462	114·80	117	19,362	165·49	–	—	—
New Zealand	5	318	63·60	–	—	—	7	473	67·57	12	1,575	131·25
Canada	97	8,693	89·62	58	1,795	30·95	30	875	29·17	106	4,165	39·29
United States of America	290	10,796	37·23	108	6,513	60·31	59	3,441	58·32	15	610	40·66
Argentine Republic	5	412	82·40	17	887	52·18	50	3,680	73·60	13	627	48·23

EXPORTED TO	1875.			1876.			1877.			1878.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	–	—	–	3	331	110·33	1	30	30·00	31	3,680	118·71
New Zealand	55	6,875	125·00	32	4,036	126·13	5	2,050	410·00	–	—	—
Canada	57	2,501	43·88	95	38,620	406·53	10	390	39·00	33	1,153	34·94
United States of America	50	8,615	172·30	56	14,060	251·07	42	1,615	38·45	176	6,545	37·18
Argentine Republic	5	600	120·00	3	650	216·67	20	1,121	56·05	91	6,423	70·58

EXPORTED TO	1879.			1880.			1881.			1882.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	85	28,265	332·53	15	6,334	422·27	10	1,575	157·50	–	—	—
New Zealand	19	5,950	313·16	17	1,630	95·88	2	280	140·00	23	2,383	103·61
Canada	54	2,310	42·78	494	29,774	60·27	689	27,590	40·04	1,174	40,927	34·86
United States of America	110	5,860	53·27	227	6,572	28·95	250	10,969	43·88	933	38,634	41·41
Argentine Republic	156	10,947	70·17	95	6,703	70·56	261	20,793	79·67	207	18,926	91·43

EXPORTED TO	1883.			1884.			1885.			1886.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	–	—	—	8	397	49·62		99	33·00	4	220	55·00
New Zealand	15	1,675	111·67	–	—	—	–	—	—	–	—	—
Canada	2,007	55,704	27·80	1,131	28,719	25·39	1,331	32,879	24·70	604	22,379	37·05
United States of America	2,803	114,477	40·84	1,124	47,798	42·52	691	27,550	39·87	562	19,109	34·00
Argentine Republic	115	8,774	76·30	401	36,236	90·36	318	20,155	63·38	699	37,484	53·63

EXPORTED TO	1887.			1888.			1889.			1890.			1891.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	3	200	66·67	108	11,047	102·29	15	1,870	124·67	31	4,318	139·29	57	3,865	67·81
New Zealand	–	—	–	–	—	–	2	370	185·00	–	—	–	2	80	40·00
Canada	151	4,695	31·09	169	5,285	31·27	144	2,589	17·98	13	457	35·15	17	950	55·88
United States of America.	511	14,761	28·88	223	4,903	21·99	83	2,798	33·71	97	2,180	22·47	37	1,094	29·57
Argentine Republic	1,249	74,642	59·76	889	59,309	66·71	723	50,980	70·51	203	17,837	8·87	95	7,012	73·81

EXPORTED TO	1892.			1893.			1894.			1895.			1896.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	18	1,087	60·39	8	314	39·25	13	861	66·23	6	179	29·83	10	674	67·40
New Zealand	19	831	43·74	6	423	70·50	2	655	327·50	11	300	27·27	–	—	—
Canada	43	855	19·88	20	585	29·25	26	552	21·23	10	210	21·00	19	575	30·26
United States of America.	51	2,150	42·16	18	772	42·89	46	1,515	32·93	76	2,320	30·53	14	310	22·14
Argentine Republic	130	8,252	63·46	285	17,346	60·86	167	8,799	52·69	382	22,617	59·21	989	60,549	61·22

STATEMENT showing the Exports of SHEEP and LAMBS bred in the United Kingdom from 1871 to 1896, showing the Number, the Declared Value, and the Average Price per Head, to the principal Meat-exporting Countries.

SHEEP AND LAMBS.

EXPORTED TO	1871.			1872.			1873.			1874.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	287	3,633	12·66	707	8,875	12·55	1,410	19,273	13·67	18	340	18·89
New Zealand	48	645	13·44	278	3,523	12·67	483	10,154	21·02	924	20,045	21·69
Canada	99	1,038	10·48	22	161	7·32	63	480	7·62	305	2,105	6·90
United States of America	167	2,021	12·10	261	2,661	10·20	60	339	5·65	81	1,098	13·56
Argentine Republic	119	956	8·03	379	3,455	9·12	424	4,641	10·95	75	1,437	19·16

EXPORTED TO	1875.			1876.			1877.			1878.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	–	–	–	3	20	6·67	–	–	–	4	55	13·75
New Zealand	775	19,854	25·62	102	2,960	29·02	–	–	–	–	–	–
Canada	150	958	6·39	70	1,195	17·07	100	696	6·96	119	996	8·37
United States of America	45	372	8·27	125	2,750	22·00	145	860	5·93	16	124	7·75
Argentine Republic	29	320	11·03	26	584	22·46	94	1,312	13·96	367	5,771	15·72

EXPORTED TO	1879.			1880.			1881.			1882.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	49	1,220	24·90	33	790	23·94	20	390	19·50	13	455	35·00
New Zealand	12	920	76·66	10	261	26·10	50	883	17·66	84	1,268	15·10
Canada	184	610	3·32	536	10,479	19·55	1,091	8,448	7·74	814	4,510	5·54
United States of America	63	574	9·11	355	3,346	9·43	252	1,810	7·18	778	5,937	7·63
Argentine Republic	235	3,280	13·96	95	1,481	15·59	290	3,173	10·94	467	7,558	16·18

EXPORTED TO	1883.			1884.			1885.			1886.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	50	8·30
New Zealand	192	2,330	12·14	20	166	8·30	–	–	–	–	–	–
Canada	605	2,365	3·91	359	2,155	6·00	245	718	2·93	369	1,883	5·10
United States of America	202	1,089	5·39	160	1,751	10·94	132	1,077	8·16	92	910	9·89
Argentine Republic	471	6,379	13·54	1,637	21,683	13·25	987	12,145	12·30	1,311	16,845	12·85

EXPORTED TO	1887.			1888.			1889.			1890.			1891.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	–	–	–	110	1,913	17·39	74	1,406	19·00	13	276	21·23	104	3,049	29·32
New Zealand	–	–	–	–	–	–	12	237	19·75	13	265	20·38	76	2,040	26·84
Canada	535	2,111	3·94	2,092	12,318	5·89	589	1,757	2·98	1,893	8,394	4·43	3,105	19,790	6·37
United States of America	830	3,759	4·53	792	3,722	4·70	1,108	5,476	4·94	1,195	5,979	5·00	1,952	9,030	4·63
Argentine Republic	2,014	29,903	14·85	1,403	21,274	15·16	2,007	29,869	14·88	711	9,987	14·05	962	10,966	11·40

EXPORTED TO	1892.			1893.			1894.			1895.			1896.		
	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.	No.	Declared Value.	Average Price per Head.
		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.		£.	£.
Australia	66	2,074	31·42	79	1,406	17·79	18	265	14·72	87	1,473	16·93	24	386	16·08
New Zealand	49	775	15·82	95	1,949	20·52	62	1,281	20·66	24	625	26·04	31	746	24·06
Canada	2,861	13,601	4·75	2,024	14,985	7·40	161	1,035	6·43	351	1,383	3·94	184	953	5·18
United States of America	259	1,960	7·57	1,629	6,282	3·86	146	962	6·59	261	1,586	6·08	125	908	7·26
Argentine Republic	1,586	15,282	9·64	2,015	22,124	10·98	1,737	22,403	12·89	2,823	37,549	13·28	7,206	88,867	12·33

Statistical Office, Custom House, London,
15 July 1897.

I N D E X.

[*N.B.*—In this Index the Figures following the Names of the Witnesses, and those in the Digest of Evidence of each Witness, refer to the Questions in the Evidence; the Figures following *App.* to the Pages in the Appendix; and the Numerals following *Rep.* and *Special Rep.* to the Pages in the Reports and Proceedings of the Committee.]

A.

ABATTOIRS. Evidence purporting to show that the branding of English meat would involve the establishment of public abattoirs, *Rew* 314–320. 364–367.

Aberdeenshire. Statement by Mr. Duthie (one of the greatest breeders of cattle in this country) as to the unanimous opinion of Aberdeenshire shorthorn breeders that the Bill contains at least one fatal clause, *Cooper* 621——Particulars respecting the different breeds of Aberdeen cattle sent to America, *ib.* 967–979.

American Beef. Explanation that the metal labels on American beef are a guarantee by the Government as to the soundness of the meat, *Cooper* 531–539. 694–698——Concurrence in the opinion as to the superiority of the American chilled beef to that of the animals slaughtered on import, *Terrett* 1400–1409. 1436–1438. 1532–1535. 1569–1582; *Cameron* 3719. 3759——Question of price combined with quality an undoubted inducement to the poorer class s to buy American beef, *Terrett* 1415——Information as to the American chilled meat being imported and sold in quarters, and the imported wharf-killed animals in sides, *ib.* 1451–1457.

Reasons for the preference given to American rather than to Irish imported cattle, *Stephenson* 3272, 3273. 3354–3359——Information as to the great improvement in American and South American cattle during the last few years; belief that English cattle are deteriorating, *ib.* 3273, 3274. 3301. 3360.

Experience that the best American beef killed at Birkenhead is above the average of English; illustration in support of this opinion, *Byrne* 3780–3788. 3803–3807. 3832–3838. 3878–3883——Practice to sell the Birkenhead-killed meat at the same price as the home-grown, *ib.* 3789–3795——Impossibility of distinguishing between some English and American meat, *ib.* 3795. 3879, 3880.

Opinion that the Bill will increase the sale of American refrigerated meat to the detriment of the home producer, *Coggan* 4089–4094. 4144–4151

See also *Birkenhead.* *Live Meat.* *Meat.*

Appeal. Desirability, should the Bill become law, of establishing a Court of Appeal similar to that appointed in Birmingham; explanation of the proposed formation of the Court, *Coggan* 4112–4117.

Argentina. See *South America.*

Army Contracts. Objection to soldiers being supplied with meat cut from foreign cattle killed on arrival, *Jeffreys* 470. 478. 480, 481——Information respecting the class of meat provided for the Army, *Hopkins* 3094–3103.

Australia. Objection to the classification of Australian products as foreign; preference given to the word "Australian," *Sinclair* 3580–3582. 3629–3631——Evidence showing it to be the practice of Victoria and New South Wales to brand their products, *ib.* 3583, 3584. 3628——Information in regard to the Exports Bill now under the consideration of the Victorian Government, *ib.* 3585–3595. 3637, 3638——Details showing the magnitude of the Australian frozen meat trade with Great Britain, *ib.* 3596–3602.

Practice in the Australian Colonies to have a system of stock inspection, *Sinclair* 3603–3612——Statement as to the immunity of the cattle from disease, *ib.* 3605–

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Australia—continued.

3605-3609. 3659-3663——Enumeration of the various countries to which Australian meat is exported, *Sinclair* 3617-3621.

Custom of the Australian Colonies to mark the meat on the wrappers, *Sinclair* 3632-3636——Explanation that witness is appointed by the Victorian Government to inspect all products on their arrival in England, *ib.* 3638-3642——Grounds for denying the statement made in the House of Commons that Australian meat was liable to cause disease, *ib.* 3642-3653.

See also *Cheese.* *Live Meat.* *Meat.* *Tuberculosis.*

B.

BACON AND HAMS:

1. *As to the Branding of Home and Foreign Bacon and Hams.*
2. *As to the relative Quality and Price of British and Foreign Bacon ana Ham of different kinds, and the amount of Imports.*

1. *As to the Branding of Home and Foreign Bacon and Hams:*

Explanation of the method adopted for marking the first quality of bacon, *Smith* 2117-2121. 2263-2269——The inferior Wiltshire bacon is not branded and is sold at a cheaper rate, *ib.* 2118. 2119——Conclusion that the marking of Wiltshire bacon has been advantageous but that witness would object to such branding being made compulsory, *ib.* 2167-2171——Evidence showing that there is no very great necessity for the further marking of foreign bacon, *ib.* 2172-2178——Denial that foreign unmarked bacon is imported and afterwards marked and branded as Wiltshire, *ib.* 2196-2204.

Practice of the best curers to mark particular cuts their with own brand, *Kellitt* 2346. 2354-2364. 2446. 2512, 2513——Obligation under the Merchandise Marks Act to mark the boxes in which the American bacon is packed "Produce of America," *ib.* 2350-2353. 2508-2511——Impossibility of branding very small pieces of bacon, *ib.* 2371, 2372. 2569, 2570——Improbability of the trade raising any objection to the branding of the sides and hams of bacon provided the marking did not apply to small pieces, *ib.* 2446-2458. 2514-2516. 2558-2572. 2602-2604. 2618-2671.

Conclusion as to the desirability of branding bacon and ham, *Page* 2751-2753——Reference to the custom of the best makers to brand their bacon, *Tee* 3214-3218——Opinion that American bacon is branded "Wiltshire cut," &c., in order that retailers may distinguish the particular shape they require, and that it is not intended to mislead the public, *ib.* 3230-3239.

2. *As to the relative Quality and Price of British and Foreign Bacon and Ham of different kinds, and the amount of Imports:*

Particulars respecting the quality and price of the various kinds of English, Irish, and foreign bacon; testimony to the goodness of the foreign imports, which, although not attaining the standard of high-class Wiltshire bacon, are of good quality, *Smith* 2146-2150——Experience that no smoked bacon is imported, *ib.* 2205-2210——Testimony to the great improvement in Danish-fed bacon, *ib.* 2211-2214.

Experience at Liverpool that customers do not ask the country of origin of bacon or hams, but select the pieces they require according to the quality, *Kellitt* 2311-2314. 2644——Evidence showing that the retailers can easily distinguish the nationality of the produce sold by them; an Irish and an American ham produced and their different qualities explained, *ib.* 2315-2323. 2330-2332. 2606, 2607——Possibility of detecting the difference in the kinds of bacon when it is cut into pieces, *ib.* 2324-2329. 2552-2557——Explanation of the difference between Cumberland and Irish hams, *ib.* 2333-2336.

Photographs of the different cuts of American bacon produced and explained by witness; they are named "Cumberland," "Wiltshire," &c., after the various English counties, *Kellitt* 2338-2344. 2530-2552. 2646-2650——Question as to whether the bacon in the shops at Liverpool is ticketed according to the above names; this is not usual, *ib.* 2345-2349——Opinion that most American bacon is of good quality, but that doubtless people would prefer Wiltshire were it not for the difference in price, *ib.* 2365-2370. 2517-2529——Reference to the prosecutions brought by the Bacon Curers' Association against certain tradesmen; complaint that they are harassing to the trade, *ib.* 2374. 2458-2482.——Question regarding the particular cut chiefly sold at Liverpool by Fowler Brothers; it is mostly American, Cumberland cut, *ib.* 2416-2425.

Examination as to the object of witness' firm (Fowler Brothers) in cutting bacon in imitation of English cuts; this is done in order to suit the requirements of the particular customers and districts, and that it is not intended as a deception, *Kellitt,* 2440-2446——Attention of witness called to the upward tendency in the price of pigs that has

Bacon and Hams—continued.

2. *As to the relative Quality, &c.*—continued.

has taken place since the prosecutions by the Bacon Curers' Association, *Kellitt* 2482–2485——Statement that witness would have no objection to a license and a monopoly, *ib.* 2496, 2497. 2674–2676——Preference given in London to the "Wiltshire cut" bacon, *ib.* 2539–2545.

Explanation of the method adopted by retailers at Liverpool in selling bacon; custom to cut up a side into small pieces from which the customer makes his selection, *Kellitt*, 2593–2605——Expression of confidence in the honesty of the trade; in the event of a customer asking for English bacon he would get it, *ib.* 2600. 2608. 2608–2618. 2651–2657. 2677–2679.

Conclusion that the marking of sides of bacon will have no effect as far as the consumer is concerned, *Tee* 3168, 3169. 3182. 3194–3196——Particulars as to the great improvement in the Danish bacon trade; this bacon now obtains a higher price than Irish, *ib.* 3169–3172. 3163. 3207–3211. 3264, 3265——Opinion that there is very little fraud in the bacon trade, *ib.* 3173——Information as to the class of bacon sold by witness' firm, showing it to be mostly foreign, *ib.* 3174. 3183, 3184.

Experience that the public choose bacon according to its quality, without inquiry as to the country of origin, *Tee* 3175–3181. 3189–3192. 3212, 3213. 3219–3221——Examination as to the variation in price between English and foreign bacon; experience that it is but slight, *ib.* 3815–3887——Discussion respecting certain proceedings instituted by the Bacon Curers' Association, *ib.* 3240–3255. 3259–3262——Unsuitability of English bacon for the London trade, *ib.* 3262–3265.

Evidence to the effect that the terms "Wiltshire Cut," &c., "Yorkshire Cut," &c., are intended as a guide to the retailer, and would not be used to mislead the public, *Hudson* 4233–4237——Information as to the kinds of bacon sold by witness' firm, *ib.* 4238–4242.

Bacon and Hams. Statistics of the quantities of hams and of bacon imported in each of the years 1892–96; *App.* 185. 190. 195.

Beef. See the *Headings generally throughout the Index.*

Beach, W. H., M.R.C.V.S. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Statement showing that witness (who is ex-Mayor of Bridgnorth) has invented an instrument by means of which meat can be easily marked; mutton chop produced and branded, 2283–2289. 2299, 2300——Information respecting the cost and durability of this instrument, 2290–2294——Opinion that a man could mark a carcase in fifteen seconds, 2295–2298.

Belgium. Explanation that all meat exposed for sale in Belgium must be stamped, *Jeffreys* 380–390——Details in regard to the three marks employed, viz., the Brussels stamp, the provincial stamp, and the stamp for imported meat, *ib.* 392–396. 399. 410——The stamp is a guarantee of the soundness of the meat, *ib.* 396. 430–438.

Description of the manner in which the meat is stamped; impression of the stamp, handed in, *Jeffreys* 397–399——Short space of time occupied in stamping the carcases, *ib.* 399——Evidence showing that in some towns the further stamping of joints is carried out by the municipal authorities, *ib.* 399–409——Experience as to the difficulty in erasing the stamp, *ib.* 402. 417–419——Practice to impose a severe penalty on a butcher attempting to stamp meat, *ib.* 411–416.

Information respecting the number of oxen, &c., killed weekly in the Government abattoir at Brussels, *Jeffreys* 428, 429——Very small cost of marking, *ib.* 438, 439. 459.

Assertion that the law of Belgium precludes the importation of ordinary carcases of meat, *Cooper* 541, 542. 1014–1016. 1024——Uselessness from the consumer's point of view, of applying the Belgium system of marking, *Terrett* 1395–1399.

Birkenhead. Evidence showing that cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead are dressed according to requirement, *Stephenson* 3384–3386——Belief that very little frozen meat is sold by the best butchers in Birkenhead, *Byrne* 3853–3859——Larger proportion of foreign cattle are brought to Birkenhead than to Deptford, *ib.* 3860–3863.

See also *American Beef. Live Meat.*

Breeding Stock. Returns submitted by Mr. Primrose showing the high value of animals exported during twenty-six years to those countries from which we now derive the large supplies of foreign meat, *App.* 210, 211.

Butchers. Attention of witness called to a favourable statement made in regard to the Bill by the President of the Butchers' Federation before the Committee of the House of Lords; considerations which would probably lead to this expression of opinion, *Cooper* 708, 709. 805–827——Reasons which probably lead some English butchers to object to the Bill, *Cameron* 3707.

See also *Meat. Live Meat. Retail Trade.*

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Butter. Details as to the price of Canadian butter; belief that it will ultimately rival that sent from Denmark, *Robertson* 3477–3482——Information respecting the export of butter from Australia; occasionally it equals Danish in price, *Sinclair* 3622–3625.

Byrne. Michael. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is a butcher at Birkenhead and a member of the Birkenhead Town Council; has had great experience in the trade, 3773, 3774. 3796–3800. 3812–3819. 3957.

Disapproval of the Bill on the ground that the marking of meat is unnecessary and impracticable, 3775–3778. 3901–3906. 3922–3956. 3987——Opinion that unless Clause 15 is retained the Bill will be worthless and will be the cause of great litigation, 3779. 3802. 3808–3811——Experience that the best American beef killed at Birkenhead is above the average of English; illustration in support of this opinion, 3780–3788. 3803–3807. 3832–3838. 3878–3883.

Practice to sell the Birkenhead-killed meat at the same price as the home-grown, 3789–3795——Impossibility of distinguishing between some English and American meat, 3795. 3879, 3880——Experience that South American meat is not so good in quality as States and Canadian, 3820–3825. 3872–3877.

Examination as to the difference in price paid by retailers for English and foreign beef; it is not more than from ½*d.* to ¾*d.* per lb., 3826–3831. 3958–3967——Disagreement with statement made by Mr. Davies on the foregoing point, 3828–3830——Discussion respecting the proposal for registration; opinion that it would be neither beneficial to butchers nor protective to the public, 3839–3850. 3980–3986.

Good judgment of the public in the choice of meat, 3850–3852——Belief that very little frozen meat is sold by the best butchers in Birkenhead, 3853–3859——Statement that a larger proportion of cattle are brought to Birkenhead than to Deptford, 3860–3863.

Detailed information in regard to the percentages of English and foreign cattle affected with tuberculosis; probability that with English cattle in the Hundred of Wirral it would be about 10 to 12 per cent., and with the foreign about 1 per cent., 3863–3871. 3907–3917. 3988–4023——Question as to the desirability of marketing States, Canadian and South American cattle, &c., according to their country of origin, instead of classing them all in one category; belief that it would be unworkable, 3884–3892.

Disapproval of the suggestion to keep English and foreign meat at separate counters; 3893——Impossibility for an inspector to tell the country of origin of small pieces of meat, 3894–3896. 3900——Evidence showing that fraudulent practices are punishable under the present Acts, 3896–3899——Question as to the desirability of notifying to customers the origin of the meat they purchase, 3946–3956.

C.

Cameron, Henry Charles. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is Inspector of Produce in England for the New Zealand Government; has been for years connected with the meat and dairying industries in New Zealand, 3664–3668.

Statement that the exports of New Zealand are frozen mutton and lamb, butter, cheese, rabbits, &c., 3669——Explanation of the method adopted according to law for the marking of the above exports, 3670–3676. 3725, 3726——Evidence respecting the duties of the inspectors at the ports of shipment, 3677, 3678. 3741, 3742.

Information as to the price of New Zealand mutton, showing it to stand at a rather higher price than Australian, 3679——Testimony to the suitability of the New Zealand climate for farming purposes, 3679——Comparison of the prices of New Zealand and English mutton, 3680–3684——Reasons for believing that the importation of New Zealand meat has not injured the English farmer, 3682——Particulars respecting the very large quantity of New Zealand mutton imported annually into England, 3685–3692.

Dissent from the statement that frozen meat contributes to disease, 3694–3701. 3736–3742——Experience of witness in a business called "The New Zealand Produce Stores" in Manchester, opened solely for the sale of New Zealand produce; prejudice of the people against foreign meat, 3702–3718——Reasons which probably lead English butchers to object to the Bill, 3707.

Conclusion favourable to the marking of Colonial produce provided it is not classified as "foreign," 3708–3710. 3728–3730. 3743–3748. 3771, 3772——Probability that the Bill will prove advantageous to the English farmer, 3718. 3754–3756——Superiority of the American chilled beef to that of the animals slaughtered on import, 3719. 3759——Opinion that the beef killed on import should be designated as foreign, 3720.

Evidence purporting to show that the Bill would not prove harassing to the retail dealer, 3721–3724——Opinion that by stamping the legs and sides of the carcases protection would be afforded to the consumer, 3726, 3727. 3749–3753——View favourable to the registration of butchers dealing in foreign meat, 3730–3735——Consideration of the probable effect of the Bill on the price of meat, 3737–3769——Experience that foreign meat, cheese, &c., is often sold as English, 3771.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

CANADA:

Application of witness' evidence to Canadian mutton as well as to American beef, *Davies* 1280. 1282——Impossibility of distinguishing between Canadian and Scotch cattle either alive or dead, *Hopkin* 3045-3047. 3062-3069. 3118. 3126.

Opinion strongly in favour of marking Canadian products, *Robertson* 3431. 3515, 3156. 3547, 3548——Prohibition by the law of Canada of the sale of imitation cheese, *ib.* 3450, 3451. 3471-3473. 3492, 3493——Violation of the law, punishable by fine, if cheese and butter are not marked "Canadian" before leaving the factory, *ib.* 3452-3455——Unfairness of the suggestion to class Canadian milk and cheese imported into this country as "foreign"; desirability of branding them "Canadian," *ib.* 3456-3461. 3490, 3491. 3520-3525. 3529. 3568-3573.

Danger of Canadian cattle slaughtered on import being sold as English unless some preventive means are taken, *Robertson* 3466-3469. 3499-3511. 3534-3536——Explanation of the regulations made by the Department of Agriculture to ensure the delivery of Canadian products in the best condition, *ib.* 3470-3476. 3482.

Experience that the prohibition to store Canadian cattle in England previous to slaughter has been disadvantageous, *Robertson* 3517-3519——Desirability of marking the carcase of important Canadian cattle if it be enacted by legislation that Canadian chilled beef should be marked, *ib.* 3543-3546——Conclusion that four-fifths of the beef from Canada is sold as English and Scotch at full price, *ib.* 3549-3560.

See also *Cheese. Live Meat. Meat. Tuberculosis.*

Carcases. Probability that benefits might accrue if carcases from abroad could, without detriment, be very fully marked, *Primrose* 38——Question considered as to the practicability of ensuring the marking of carcases by the consignors; belief that this suggestion would be willingly accepted, *ib.* 63-76. 149-151.

Belief that there would be no objection to the marking of carcases at the time of importation, as is now done with all the dead foreign meat brought into this country, *Cooper* 529, 530. 540. 666. 693——Disagreement with certain evidence as to the time likely to be taken in marking carcases, *ib.* 544-552——Belief that foreign carcases might be branded without detriment by a similar method to that adopted for bacon, *Smith* 2270-2272.

Objection of farmers to the application of "British" to the carcases of foreign cattle slaughtered in this country, *Challinor* 2867——Opinion that by stamping the legs and sides of the carcases protection would be afforded to the consumer, *Cameron* 3726, 3727. 3749-3753.

Cattle. See *American Beef. Australia. Canada. Live Meat. Meat. South America. Tuberculosis.*

Central Chamber of Agriculture. Approval by the Council of the principles of the Agricultural Produce Marks Bill, *Rew* 166. 251.

Central Meat Market (*London*). Return handed in showing the whole weighed quantities of meat that passed through the Central Market during the year 1896, *Cooper* 645——Estimate that out of the total daily supply of some 1,200 tons at the Central Market there are from 100 to 150 tons of chilled American meat, and from 200 to 250 tons of American cattle killed at Deptford, *Terrett* 1560-1568.

See also *Live Meat. Meat, &c.*

Challinor, R. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Represents the interest of the Cheshire cheese industry; is secretary to the Cheshire Dairy Farmer's Association, 2848-2850. 2877-2880.

Reasons which lead the farmers to desire the introduction of the Bill, Clauses 5 and 15 excepted, 2849-2854. 2867. 2873, 2874. 2963, 2964——Evidence showing that with 25 per cent. of the tradesmen it is the practice to substitute foreign for English cheese, 2854-2862. 2909. 2976-2980. 3004-3006——Desirability of dealers in foreign produce notifying the fact by means of a signboard in addition to registration, 2864-2867. 2953-2962. 2996-3000.

Objection of farmers to the application of "British" to the carcases of foreign cattle slaughtered in this country, 2867——Probability that the Bill if enforced would increase the price of the best Cheshire cheese, 2868, 2869. 2982-2985——Consideration of the effect of the Bill on the sale of foreign cheese; belief that it would scarcely be likely to increase its sale, 2870-2876.

Particulars respecting the amount of cheese sold at the Cheshire and Nantwich fairs, 2881-2886. 2922-2929—— Information as to the kind of foreign cheese which mostly enters into competition with Cheshire, 2887-2895—— Opinion that foreign competition is greater now than it was formerly, 2896-2898. 2949-2952. 2981, 2982.

Testimony to the improvement in the quality of the Cheshire cheese made during the last ten or fifteen years, 2899-2901. 2930-2934——Preference given by the great bulk

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Challinor, R. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

of the consumers to English cheese, 2902, 2903——Evidence showing that the difference in price between Cheshire and Canadian cheese is about a penny or two-pence per lb., 2904–2908.

Information as to the districts in which Cheshire cheese has the largest sale; statement that the London trade is nearly extinct, 2910–2917——Examination as to the growth of the Cheshire cheese trade within the last ten years; opinion that it has increased considerably, 2930–2934——Explanation of the fluctuations in the price of Cheshire cheese; probability that prices are lower than they were ten years ago, 2939–2949.

Undesirability of compelling British farmers to mark their cheese unless the rule is also made applicable to foreigners, 2965–2975. 3001–3003——Experience that no filled cheese is imported from Canada, 2986–2995.

Cheese:

1. *Imports and Sale of Foreign and Colonial Cheese; Quality as compared with English.*
2. *Question of Marking Foreign and Colonial Cheese.*
3. *Home Produce; Question of Marking.*
4. *Prices.*
5. *Filled Cheese.*

1. *Imports and Sale of Foreign and Colonial Cheese; Quality as compared with English:*

Particulars in regard to the quinquennial averages of the cheeses imported since 1861, showing the increase to have been comparatively small; also, the total quantity and value of imports from different countries in 1896, *Rew* 209–219; *App.* 184——Statement that American cheese has improved, and that the best now ranks with English, but that very little of that quality is imported, *Davies* 1208-1212. 1229–1236. 1338.

Representations in detail on the part of the firm of Messrs. Hill Brothers, cheese factors of Evercreech, Somerset, who sell about 1,600 tons of cheese per annum, *Hill* 1866 *et seq.*——Evidence to the effect that Canadian and American factory cheese is sold by retailers in this country as English cheddar, *ib.* 1873–1875. 1880, 1881. 1909. 1965–1977. 1984–1988. 2081, 2082——Belief that most of the hotels and restaurants are obliged to keep English cheese owing to the impossibility of making "Welsh-rarebit" from Canadian or American cheese, *ib.* 1876–1878. 1989–1995——Advertisements quoted from Australian papers describing their own make of cheese as cheddar, *ib.* 1881, 1882.

Explanation of the reasons which render it impossible to make a fine quality of cheese in Australia, America, or Canada, *Hill* 1889–1899. 1955–1976. 1996–2011. 2050–2056. 2072–2074. 2093–2095——Statement that the public can be easily imposed upon in the matter of foreign cheese; instance given of a case at Holborn Restaurant, *ib.* 1920–1922. 1978. 2056–2065. 2075–2080. 2096–2103——Illustration of the unsuitability of American cheddar loaves for ships' stores, *ib.* 1926——Impossibility of wholesale buyers being deceived, *ib.* 2012–2014.

Description of the varying qualities of English and foreign cheese; no foreign cheese will equal the first quality of English cheddar, *Smith* 2154–2161——Explanation of the use of the word "Cheddar," showing that it is now used merely to describe the style of cheese, *ib.* 2159. 2258–2262——Impossibility of foreign cheese being substituted for English to any great extent, *ib.* 2161–2166. 2190–2193. 2240–2244——Probability that the better class of people would prefer English to foreign cheese, *ib.* 2187–2189.

Improbability of there being any great amount of fraud in the sale of cheese in this country, *Page* 2700, 2701. 2797–2801——Preference given by witness to the best English rather than to that of foreign production, although a good deal of the latter is of excellent quality, *ib.* 2725. 2742–2745——Custom to send the cheese to the grocer in the box so that he cannot be deceived as to the country of origin, *ib.* 2728–2733——Explanation as regards the use of the word "Cheddar," that it now applies to cheese made in that particular shape, *ib.* 2734–2741.

Evidence showing that with 25 per cent. of the tradesmen it is the practice to substitute foreign for English cheese, *Challinar* 2854–2862. 2909. 2976–2980. 3004–3006——Information as to the kind of foreign cheese which mostly enters into competition with Cheshire, *ib.* 2887–2895.

Practice of witness' firm to advertise their cheese as "Canadian Cheddar," *Tee* 3205, 3206——Explanation that the word "cheddar" does not designate a locality but is a system of manufacture, *Robertson* 3494–3498. 3561–3567——Testimony to the good quality of Canadian cheese, *Hudson* 4230, 4231.

Returns of the quantities of cheese imported in the years 1892–96; *App.* 190. 196.

2. *Question*

Report, 1897—*continued.*

CHEESE—continued.

2. *Question of marking Foreign and Colonial Cheese:*

Opinion that the difficulty of marking cheese, ham, and bacon would be but small, *Primrose* 77. 83, 84——Grounds for the conclusion that nothing would be gained by applying a mark to the latter, *Terrett* 1390, 1391. 1505-1507——Absence of any particular difficulty in marking cheese, if necessary, *ib.* 1392-1394.

Advocacy of the marking of cheeses on the ground that the producer would get better prices for his produce and the consumer would be certain of his purchase, *Davies* 1115-1119. 1205. 1339. 1376 *et seq.*——Concurrence in the suggestion that the regulations in regard to the sale of meat should also apply to cheese, *Hutcheson* 1766, 1767.

Reference to a letter from Mr Livesey, of Preston, expressing a desire for legislation for the protection of English cheese makers, *Hill* 1879——Desirability of stamping all foreign cheese with the name of the country of production for the protection of the consumer, buyer, and producer, *ib.* 1883-1888. 1907-1909. 1923-1933. 1979, 1980. ——Explanation of a method by which the marking could be easily carried out, *ib.* 1883. 1910, 1911. 2015-2018.

Reference to a practice existing amongst Jews of having their cheese made in Holland and marked with a special brand, *Hill* 1900. 1942-1945——Belief that the branding of foreign cheese would enable the English producer to obtain a more uniform price, *ib.* 1912. 1981-1984——Experience that the Colonies would be glad to brand their own produce, *ib.* 1934, 1935.

Practice to mark cheese on the box in which it is packed; belief that it would be very difficult to stamp the cheese itself, *Kellitt* 2573-2592——Approval of the suggestion of the Bill that cheese should be marked with the country of origin; reasons given, *Page* 2685-2688. 2704-2706. 2746-2750. 2754-2761——Evidence showing that the cheese at present imported is not always marked, *ib.* 2689-2696. 2707-2713.

Proposed method for the marking of cheese; belief that it would present no difficulty, *Page* 2697-2699. 2726——Practice under the Merchandise Marks Act to brand the place of origin on all cheese boxes, *ib.* 2727——Admission that the passing of the Bill will probably improve the foreign and colonial trade in cheese, *ib.* 2818-2841.

Consideration of the effect of the Bill on the sale of foreign cheese; belief that it would scarcely be likely to increase its sale, *Challinor* 2875, 2876——Witness offers no objection to the branding of cheese, but considers that it is unnecessary, *Tee* 3204. 3222-3224——Practice in Canada to mark cheese on the box and also on the rind by means of a stencil stamp, *Robertson* 3439, 3440. 3530-3533——Explanation of method adopted for the marking of cheese, butter, bacon, &c., *Hudson* 4201-4207.

Opinion of the Committee that the identification of foreign cheese is desirable, and that there would be no great difficulty in carrying this into effect, *Special Rep.* iii.

3. *Home Produce; Question of Marking:*

Undesirability of compelling English farmers to mark their cheese, *Hill* 1912-1919. 1946-1954. 2038-2046. 2070——Evidence showing that cheddar is made in Somerset, Dorsetshire, and Wiltshire, the latter cheese not being of such good quality, *ib.* 1997-1999——Reasons which lead to the difference in the quality of the product made at isolated farms, *ib.* 2000-2004——Practice of the Somerset County Council to send a school from district to district to learn the art of cheese making, *ib.* 2004. 2045. 2047-2049.

Concurrence in the statement as to the difficulty of producing good cheese in factories, *Hill* 2005. 2073; *Smith* 2158.

Opinion unfavourable to the branding of the cheddar made in Scotland, *Hill* 2019-2022——Consideration whether the fancy cheeses made in England in all respects similar to gruyère, gorgonzola, &c., ought not to be marked; belief that it would be unnecessary, *ib.* 2023-2034——Statement that the best cheese-makers employ no foreign substance, *ib.* 2036, 2037——Experience that English cheddar has a larger sale than any other English cheese, *ib.* 2071. 2081-2087.

Reference to the practice of making Camembert and other foreign cheeses in England; the quantity is infinitesimal, *Smith* 2183-2186——Particulars respecting the amount of cheese sold at the Cheshire and Nantwich fairs, *Challinor* 2881-2886. 2924-2929——Testimony to the improvement in the quality of the Cheshire cheese made during the last ten or fifteen years, *ib.* 2899-2901. 2930-2934——Preference given by the great bulk of the consumers to English cheese, *ib.* 2902, 2903.

Information as to the districts in which Cheshire cheese has the largest sale; statement that the London trade is nearly extinct, *Challinor* 2910-2917——Examination as to the growth of the Cheshire cheese trade within the last ten years; opinion that it has increased considerably, *ib.* 2930-2934——Undesirability of compelling British farmers to mark their cheese unless the rule is also made applicable to foreigners, *ib.* 2965-2975. 3001-3003——Examination as to the kind of cheese made in Scotland; explanation that there is a Scotch cheddar, but that Cheshire and Stilton are made in in their own localities, *Hudson* 4247-4254. 4264-4268.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

CHEESE—continued.

4. *Prices:*

Particulars respecting the variation in price between the best Canadian and the best English cheese, *Page* 2714-2723——Probability that the Bill, if enforced, would increase the price of the best Cheshire cheese, *Challinor* 2868, 2869. 2982-2985——Reference to the difference in price between Cheshire and Canadian cheese as being about a penny or twopence per pound, *ib.* 2904-2908——Explanation of the fluctuations in the price of Cheshire cheese; probability that prices are lower than they were ten years ago, *ib.* 2935-2949——Grounds for thinking it impossible that the Bill will increase the price of English cheese, *Hudson* 4229-4232. 4244-4246.

5. *Filled Cheese:*

Experience that no filled cheese is imported from Canada, *Challinor* 2986-2995——Disapproval of the trade in filled cheese, *Hudson* 4269.

Cheshire Dairy Farmers' Association. Representations in detail on the part of this association, *Challinor* 2848 *et seq.*——*See* also *Cheese.*

Chilled Meat. Explanation of the difference between "chilled" and frozen meat, *Davies* 1262-1265——Evidence respecting refrigerated or chilled meat as distinct from the frozen; difficulty of distinction in certain conditions, *Terrett* 1422-1427——Facility in distinguishing American chilled meat from home-killed meat; favourable opinion as to the quality of the former, *ib.* 1564-1571.

Objection of the colonists to chill the mutton intended for their own consumption owing to the injurious effect on the meat, *Hill* 1937-1941——Statement that the first instalment of Canadian chilled beef which arrived quite recently was marked on the cloth covering, *Robertson* 3441-3444. 3540-3542——Testimony to the superiority of refrigerated beef to that killed on import, *Coggan* 4089-4094——Evidence purporting to show that refrigeration does not impair the quality of meat, but that the defrosting of frozen meat causes the juices of the animal to exude, *ib.* 4167-4173.

See also *Frozen Meat.*

Classification (Foreign and Colonial Produce). Conclusion favourable to the marking of colonial produce, provided it is not classified as "foreign," *Cameron* 3708-3710. 3728-3730. 3743-3748. 3771, 3772——Reasons for desiring that all goods or produce should be classified as "British" or "foreign;" opinion that the term "colonial" requires consideration, *Hudson* 4208-4214. 4259-4263.

Colonies. See *Australia. Canada. Bacon and Hams. Cheese. Chilled Meat. Frozen Meat. Live Meat. Meat. New Zealand.*

Coggan, William. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is deputy-chairman of the Meat and Cattle Trade Section of the London Chamber of Commerce; is chairman of the London Butchers' Trade Society, 4024-4034.

Statement that witness agrees generally with the evidence given by Mr. Cooper, 4029-4031——Opinion unfavourable to the Bill, 4035, 4036——Explanation of the first reason on which witness opposes the Bill, viz., that any interference with the ordinary treatment will entail loss owing to the perishable nature of the article, 4038-4050——Experience that there is very little inspection of frozen meat in retail shops, 4047-4050.

Information as to the second reason for coming to a decision against the Bill, viz., the impossibility of distinguishing British meat from foreign should the former have been placed in a refrigerating chamber, 4051-4062. 4129-4135——The enormous expense which would be incurred is another reason for objecting to the Bill, 4063. 4067.

Opinion that the present inspectors are quite unqualified for their work, 4063-4066——Objection to the permission given under the Bill to inspectors to take samples of meat without payment, 4068-4071——Reasons for opposing the provision which enables a private person to institute a prosecution, 4072-4075.

Contention that the clause which provides that a prosecution may take place within three months of the date of the offence is unfair to the vendor, 4075-4077——Opinion that if Clause 15, relating to cattle slaughtered on import, is eliminated the Bill will be worthless, 4078-4081. 4088——Views of witness in denial of accusations of fraud made against the trade; reference to the price lists of the Army and Navy Stores, the British Produce Supply Company, and Harrod's Stores in confirmation of these views, 4081-4087. 4101-4112. 4140-4143. 4152-4157. 4177-4187.

Opinion that the Bill will increase the sale of American refrigerated meat to the detriment of the home producer, 4089-4094. 4144 4151——Testimony to the superiority of refrigerated beef to that killed on import, 4089-4094——Discussion as to whether the sale of good foreign meat at English price is more fraudulent than selling inferior English at the same price, 4095-4100.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Coggan, William. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Desirability, should the Bill become law, of establishing a Court of Appeal similar to that appointed in Birmingham; explanation of the proposed formation of the court, 4112-4117— Objection to the registration clause of the Bill, 4117, 4118——Information in regard to a draft Bill prepared by the London Butchers' Society, 4122—4127 ——Memorandum read by witness in connection with Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill; contention that they include retail sales, 4127.

Reasons which lead to the opinion that English cattle are deteriorating, 4127, 4128. 4163-4166—— Impossibility of detecting the difference between the better class of foreign meat and English meat, 4136-4139——Consideration of the methods suggested for the marking of meat; grounds for objecting to the use of ink or electricity, 4158-4162—— Evidence purporting to show that refrigeration does not impair the quality of meat, but that the defrosting of frozen meat causes the juices of the animal to exude, 4167-4173——Belief that there are inspectors at Deptford to prevent the sale of meat affected by tuberculosis, 4174-4176.

Competition. Opinion that foreign competition in cheese, &c., is greater now than it was formerly, *Challinor* 2896-2898. 2949-2952. 2981, 2182.

See also *American Beef. Australia. Bacon and Hams. Cheese. Live Meat. Meat. Price.*

Consumers. Belief that purchasers have a preference for English meat, *Rew* 235-245—— Improbability of a customer being able, in the majority of cases, to differentiate between English and foreign joints, *ib.* 338. 374-383——Probability that an expert would generally be able to distinguish frozen meat from fresh, and that the general public are not very likely to be imposed upon in this matter, *Cooper* 729, 730. 799-801. 858-862; *Terrett* 1420, 1421.

Advantages likely to accrue to consumers in the event of the origin of the meat being made apparent, *Terrett* 1442——Doubt as to the public generally preferring English to foreign meat, even at the same price, *ib.* 1443, 1444——Objection on the part of the public to any marks on the meat they purchase, *ib.* 1499-1504——Grounds for the opinion that the Bill is necessary for the protection of the public, *Hutcheson* 1613. 1635-1637. 1680. 1704-1709. 1719-1722. 1727-1733. 1750-1752. 1773-1776.

Opinion in favour of marking high-class foreign produce in order to protect the home consumer, *Smith* 2113-2115. 2151, 2152. 2179, 2180. 2226-2233. 2275-2282——Belief that the Bill would afford a certain amount of protection to consumers, *Page* 2788-2805. 2842-2847—— Question considered as to the Bill benefiting the producer at the expense of the consumer, *ib.* 2806-2817.

Good judgment of the public in the choice of meat, *Byrne* 3850-3852—— Opinion that all goods should be marked for the information of the public, *Hudson* 4219-4228. 4243.

Continental Meat. Opinion that it is most difficult to differentiate between Continental meat which is not frozen and English meat, *Cooper* 574-577.——See *Belgium.*

Cooper, William. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness is Chairman of the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of the London Chamber of Commerce; experience as a tenant farmer in Aberdeenshire for the last thirty years, 482-488.

Unanimous disapproval of the Bill by the Meat and Cattle Trades Section of the London Chamber of Commerce; resolution passed by that body on this subject, read by witness, 489-499—— Grounds for the opinion that the Bill will benefit the foreign producer at the expense of the British agriculturist, 497. 500-506. 710-712. 736-740. 871-889. 934-943. 1006-1008——Contention that the Bill by allowing foreign cattle killed at the port of entry to be described as British meat is most unjust, and would be misleading to the public, 503. 507-509. 601-604. 715-723. 771. 776-789. 994-1098.

Reference to the petition of the London Central Meat and Poultry Markets Association; unanimity of the petitioners against the provisions of the Bill as impracticable and liable to harass legitimate trade, 510-513. 543, 544——Impossibility in the case of small retailers to provide separate departments for British and foreign produce, 513-528. 578-584. 724-726—— Belief that there would be no objection to the marking of carcases at the time of importation, as is now done with all the dead foreign meat brought into this country, 529, 530. 540. 666. 693.

Statement that the metal labels on American beef are a guarantee by the Government as to the soundness of the meat, 531-539. 694-698——Assertion that the law of Belgium precludes the importation of ordinary carcases of meat, 541, 542. 1014-1016. 1024——Dissent from certain evidence in regard to the time likely to be taken in marking carcases, 544-552.

View that there is no necessity to mark meat for the wholesale trade owing to the impossibility of any deception being practised, 544. 553, 554. 691, 692. 794-798—— Probability that an expert would generally be able to distinguish frozen meat from fresh, and that the general public are not very likely to be imposed upon in this matter, 729, 730.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Cooper, William. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

799–801. 858–862——Opinion that it is most difficult to differentiate between continental meat which is not frozen and English meat, 574–577.

Belief that the marking of every joint would be practically impossible, 580–584. 699–707. 790–793——Experience that a large proportion of the meat in the wholesale market is sold to retailers in portions rather than in carcases, 585–594. 794, 795——Evidence to the effect that it is impossible for an expert to detect English joints from foreign when the animals have been killed in this country, 594–600. 671–675.

Consideration of the question of appointing inspectors; belief that it would involve great expense, 605–610. 731–735. 944–948——Objection to the clause in the Bill which allows a prosecution against a butcher within a period of three months from the time that the meat was taken by the inspector; opinion that this is too long a limit, 610–615——Probability that an expert would experience great difficulty in deciding between home and foreign meat had the former been refrigerated, 616–620. 657–665. 842–847.

Reference to the disapproval by Mr. Duthie, the shorthorn breeder in Aberdeenshire, of a certain clause in the Bill, 621——Reasons for disapproving of the suggestion that dealers in foreign meat should be registered, 622–628. 652–657. 741–752. 831–834. 904–906——Undesirability of compelling retail dealers selling foreign meat to place a notice to that effect over their shops, 628–632. 676–680. 684, 685.

Testimony to the good quality of the dead meat imported into this country; belief that it is superior to the very best of the second class of English-fed bullocks, 633–636. 681–683. 713, 835–841——Objection to the wording of Clause 4 of the Bill, on the ground of its ambiguity, 637–651——Return handed in showing the whole weighed quantities of meat that passed through the central market during the year 1896; 645.

Reasons for believing that the Bill will create rather than remove difficulties, 686–692. 740. 772–775. 863–870. 991–993——Explanation that witness objects to any form of marking, 688. 739——Attention of witness called to a favourable statement made in regard to the Bill by the president of the Butchers' Federation before the Committee of the House of Lords; explanation of the reasons which would probably lead to this expression of opinion, 708, 709. 805–827.

Experience that the public consider the price of meat rather than the quality, 727–730. 753, 754. 802–804——Opinion that a butcher who sells foreign meat as English could be prosecuted by the purchaser under the Food and Drugs Act, 755–760——Examination as to whether a retail tradesman can always distinguish between English and foreign meat; belief that he can, 761–770.

Consideration of the injury to dealers in first-class meat by any misrepresentation on the part of the retailer as to the origin of the meat, 848–850——Statement that the price of the home supply is indirectly affected by the relative price of foreign importations, 851, 852——Experience that the large influx of foreign meat has done away with the inferior qualities of English meat formerly sold, 853–855.

Question as to whether home-killed foreign meat is as good as the foreign refrigerated meat; reasons for believing that the latter is preferable, 856, 857——Information respecting the large amount of foreign meat consumed in the metropolis; statement that it forms two-thirds of the total consumption, 890–893. 927–933——Details of the prices at which the best joints of foreign and English meat are sold, 894–903. 986–990. 1012, 1013——Reference to a case in which an expert was deceived in a consignment of meat, 907.

Evidence showing that, for purposes of inspection, it would be necessary to take a very large quantity of meat in order to arrive at a true decision, 908–914——Objection to the clause which enables samples of food, in regard to which no offence under the Act could be committed, to be taken for inspection, 915, 916. 918–922.——Desirability of establishing a tribunal of appeal for determining disputes arising between inspectors and retailers, 917.

Statement that many of the shops trading as Farmers' Associations are carried on by private individuals, 925, 926——Opinion that the English farmer is being practically driven out of the London trade in beef owing to his being unable to compete with the Americans, 927–930——Improbability of the marking of meat reducing its price to the poor, 938–941.

Consideration of the possibility of an inspector, when called upon by a customer, being unable to decide whether the meat was English or foreign; belief that it would be very difficult, 949–952——Explanation of the various ways of dressing meat; the difference between the dressing of American and English meat is almost imperceptible, 953–966——Particulars respecting the different breeds of Aberdeen cattle sent to America, 967–979——Testimony to the good condition in which the cattle from abroad arrive at Deptford, 980–985.

Report, 1897—*continued*

Cooper, William. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Belief that the House of Lords Committee had great difficulty in arriving at any conclusion in regard to marking, 1009–1019—Evidence showing that tuberculosis is much more prevalent amongst English and Scotch cattle than amongst foreign cattle, 1017–1023—Suggestion that the Committee should visit Deptford, and also the Central Meat Markets, 1025–1028—Statement that the process of freezing causes deterioration of the meat, 1029.

Cream Cheese. Equality of the American and the English full cream cheese, *Kellitt* 2641–2643. 2672, 2673.

Customs Department. Explanation that under the Bill the Customs would have no power to take action at the time of importation; reasons for believing that any such action is not requisite, and would be impracticable, *Primrose* 28–53. 59–62.

See also *Meat* (*Foreign Dead Meat*).

D.

Davies, Thomas. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness is Chairman of the Wirrall Farmers' Club, a combination of some 160 farmers, &c., in the district extending from Chester to Birkenhead; is prepared to give evidence upon the meat and cheese question, 1030–1037. 1142. 1183–1188. 1213–1216.

Approval of the provisions of Clause 5 of the Bill, subject to the suggestion that dealers in foreign meat should exhibit notices to the effect that they are duly registered, 1038–1045. 1164. 1238–1240. 1259. 1341. 1357—Objection to Clause 15, witness submitting that, in the interests of the farmer and consumer, all meat imported alive and slaughtered in England should be classed as foreign, and the dealers scheduled, 1046, 1047. 1065. 1072–1077. 1109. 1120. 1137. 1140. 1155–1163. 1176, 1177. 1275. 1283. 1323. 1337. 1351.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that frozen meat is readily recognisable and, consequently, enters into no competition with the best English, 1048–1062. 1144–1151. 1154. 1224–1228. 1266. 1297—Difficulty in distinguishing between English grown meat and that imported alive and killed after a proper interval from the time of landing, the quality being practically the same, 1063–1064. 1066–1068. 1121–1129. 1138. 1207. 1250. 1267–1273. 1284–1290. 1296. 1318–1320.

Examination to the effect that the marking of imported live meat would be advantageous to the English grower and consumer, but that in the case of frozen meat the necessity is not so apparent, 1078–1098. 1143. 1152, 1153. 1194. 1198–1204. 1223. 1259–1261. 1276. 1327, 1328—Comparison between the price of English and foreign beef, showing that the latter is cheaper by 1*d.* or 2*d.* per lb. 1099–1106. 1195–1197. 1242, 1243. 1304–1313.

Admission that the working classes would be more likely to purchase the cheaper beef, and so create a greater demand for imported meat to the detriment of the English producer, 1107–1109. 1112, 1113, 1170–1175. 1178–1182. 1252. 1334. 1341—Statement that the better classes would prefer paying higher prices provided they could be certain of obtaining home-grown produce, 1110, 1111. 1114. 1166–1169. 1217–1222. 1251–1253. 1277. 1324.

Grounds for advocating the marking of cheese, on the ground that the producer would get better prices for his produce, and the consumer would be certain of his purchase, 1115–1119. 1205. 1339. 1376 *et seq.*—Rarity of tuberculosis among the foreign cattle; denial, however, that there is a balance in favour of the health of the foreign imports, 1136. 1139. 1254–1258—Statement that American cheese has improved, and that the best now ranks with English, but that very little of that quality is imported, 1208–1212. 1229–1236. 1338.

Explanation of the difference between "chilled" and frozen meat, 1262–1265—Application of witness' evidence to Canadian mutton as well as to American beef, 1280–1282—Question as to the probability of difficulty in applying the provisions of the Bill, 1291–1295. 1371—Suggestion that in butchers' shops separate compartments should be provided for the sale of foreign meat, 1361–1370.

Dead Meat. See *Meat.*

Denmark. Unsatisfactory quality of the Danish cattle and the pork from Ostend, *Terrett* 1536–1548—Evidence showing that in Denmark all meat is marked, mutton chops also bearing an impress, *Smith* 2122–2130. 2217–2225—Information as to the branding of cheese; practice to mark all those of finest quality unless the purchaser raises an objection, *ib.* 2130–2135. 2273, 2274.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Deptford. See *Live Meat.*

Draft Report. Draft Special Report as proposed by the Chairman of the Committee *Special Rep.* vi.——Amendments adopted and added thereto, *ib.* vi, vii.

Duthie, Mr. See *Aberdeenshire.*

E.

Eggs, Poultry, &c. Evidence showing that it is practicable to mark eggs, poultry, fruit, and butter on the boxes only, *Robertson* 3432–3438. 3526–3528. 3537–3539.

F.

Farmers. Opinion that the farmers are unanimously in favour of the principles of the Bill; they consider that all meat should be sold on its own merits, *Rew* 167–173. 234. 287–290—— Consideration of the risk to the English farmer should the public prefer foreign meat to English owing to its being of good quality and cheap, *ib.* 338–350.

Evidence in support of the conclusion that the Bill will benefit the foreign producer at the expense of the British agriculturist, *Cooper* 497. 500–506. 710–712. 736–740. 871–889. 934–943. 1006–1008—— Opinion that the English farmer is being driven out of the London trade owing to his being unable at present to compete with the American producer of beef, *ib.* 927–930——Contention that Clause 15 in its present state would be very prejudicial to agriculturists, *Terrett* 1414.

Examination respecting the probability of the Bill proving of no benefit to agriculturists; willingness of witness to run the risk, *Hutcheson* 1704–1743——Belief that the advantages accruing to the agriculturists from the present Bill are remote, *Smith* 2181, 2182. 2194, 2195; *Hopkin* 3031–3035. 3059—— Opinion that many English farmers are in need of some stimulus to make them improve the class of their products, *Smith* 2233–2236.

Grounds for believing that the Bill will benefit neither the farmer nor the consumer, *Kellitt* 2619–2631——Reasons which lead the farmers to desire the introduction of the Bill, Clauses 5 and 15 excepted, *Challinor* 2849–2854. 2867. 2873, 2874. 2963, 2964 ——Experience that the sale of foreign meat has proved detrimental to farmers, *Hopkin* 3039——Probability that the Bill will prove advantageous to the English farmer, *Cameron* 3718. 3754–3756.

Farmers' Association (*Sale of Meat*). Statement that many of the shops trading as farmers' associations are carried on by private individuals, *Cooper* 925, 926.

Food and Drugs Act. Opinion that a butcher who sells foreign meat as English could be prosecuted by the purchaser under the Food and Drugs Act, *Cooper* 755–760.

Foreign Countries. Examination as to the adoption of branding by other countries besides Belgium; belief that, with the exception of France, most countries have introduced marks, *Jeffreys* 420–427.

See also *Bacon, Hams, &c.* *Belgium.* *Cheese.* *Live Meat.* *Meat, &c.*

Fraud. Opinion that the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords practically proved that foreign meat and cheese are sold as English; impossibility of estimating the quantity thus misrepresented, *Rew* 229–233. 333–337. 372, 373. 386, 387——Attention called to a leading article in the "Mark Lane Express," exposing the fraudulent practice of selling foreign meat as English; this article read, *Hutcheson* 1615–1617. 1622. 1782–1785. 1842, 1843——Experience that foreign meat, cheese, &c., are often sold as English, *Cameron* 3771——Evidence showing that fraudulent practices are punishable under the present Acts, *Byrne* 3896–3899.

Views of witness in denial of accusations of fraud made against the retail trade; reference to the price lists of the Army and Navy Stores, the British Produce Supply Company, and Harrod's Stores in confirmation of these views, *Coggan* 4081–4087. 4101–4112. 4140–4143. 4152–4157. 4177–4187——Discussion as to whether the sale of good foreign meat at English price is more fraudulent than selling inferior English at the same price, *ib.* 4095–4100.

See also *Merchandise Marks Act.* *Prosecutions.* *Retail Trade.*

Frozen Meat. Opinion that the majority of purchasers can readily distinguish between frozen and fresh meat, *Cooper* 729, 730. 799–801. 858–862; *Terrett* 1420, 1421—— Conclusion that the process of freezing causes deterioration of the meat, *Cooper* 1029 —— Evidence in support of the conclusion that frozen meat is readily recognisable, and consequently enters into no competition with the best English, *Davies* 1048–1062. 1144–1151. 1154. 1224–1228. 1266. 1297.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Frozen Meat—continued.

View of witness that frozen meat is easy of detection, but that with chilled meat detection is much more difficult, *Hutcheson* 1647-1651——Conclusion that frozen mutton can easily be detected, but that refrigerated meat is very difficult to distinguish, *Hopkin* 3023-3028. 3107-3112——Evidence showing that frozen meat is easily detected, but that it is almost impossible to distinguish the foreign meat slaughtered on import, *Stephenson* 3280, 3281.

Particulars respecting some experiments carried out by Dr. Rideal in connection with the digestive and nutritive properties of frozen meat: conclusion expressed by him and by the "British Medical Journal" that there is no loss of nutritious properties, *Sinclair* 3654-3662——Dissent from a statement that frozen meat contributes to disease, *Cameron* 3694-3701. 3736-3742.

See also *Australia.* *Chilled Meat.*

G.

Grocers. Statement that the retail grocers at Liverpool do not wish for the Bill, *Kellitt* 2634-2640. 2645——Question in regard to the manner in which the Bill would affect the business of grocers; explanation of the views of witness on this subject, *Page* 2762-2768.

H.

Hams. See *Bacon and Hams.*

Highland Agricultural Society. Unanimous resolution passed by the Highland Agricultural Society against the clause of the Bill which would regard foreign animals slaughtered after import as English meat, *Hutcheson* 1595-1599. 1621. 1697, 1698. 1746-1757. 1765. 1769. 1828, 1829——With the above exception the Highland Society are in favour of the Bill, *ib.* 1600. 1745.

Hill, Edmond. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness is senior partner in the firm of Messrs. Hill Brothers, cheese factors, of Evercreech, Somerset; the firm sell about 1,600 tons of cheese per annum, 1866-1872. 2088-2092.

Evidence showing that Canadian and American factory cheese is sold by retailers in this country as English Cheddar, 1873-1875. 1880, 1881. 1909. 1965-1977. 1984-1988. 2081, 2082——Belief that most of the hotels and restaurants are obliged to keep English cheese owing to the impossibility of making "Welsh-rabbit" from Canadian or American cheese, 1876-1878. 1989-1995——Reference to a letter from a Mr. Livesey, of Preston, expressing a desire for legislation for the protection of English cheese makers, 1879.

Advertisements quoted from Australian papers describing their own make of cheese as Cheddar, 1881, 1882——Desirability of stamping all foreign cheese with the name of the country of production for the protection of the consumer, buyer, and producer, 1883-1888. 1907-1909. 1923-1933. 1979, 1986——Explanation of a method by which the marking could be easily carried out, 1883. 1910, 1911. 2015-2018.

Explanation of the reasons which render it impossible to make a fine quality of cheese in Australia, America, or Canada, 1889-1899. 1955-1976. 1996-2011. 2050-2056. 2072-2074. 2093-2095——Reference to a practice existing amongst Jews of having their cheese made in Holland and marked with a special brand, 1900. 1942-1945——Evidence showing that English cheese, bacon, and hams have a good sale in New Zealand and fetch a high price, 1901, 1902.

Expression of opinion favourable to the marking of meat, 1903-1906——Belief that the branding of foreign cheese would enable the English producer to obtain a more uniform price, 1912. 1981-1984——Undesirability of compelling English farmers to mark their cheese, 1912-1919. 1946-1954. 2038-2046. 2070——Statement that the public can be easily imposed upon in the matter of foreign cheese; instance given of a case at Holborn Restaurant, 1920-1922. 1978. 2056-2065. 2075-2080. 2096-2103.

Illustration of the unsuitability of American Cheddar loaves for ships' stores, 1926——Experience that the colonies would be glad to brand their own produce, 1934, 1935——Objection of the colonists to chill the mutton intended for their own consumption, owing to the injurious effect on the meat, 1937-1941.

Evidence showing that Cheddar is made in Somerset, Dorsetshire, and Wiltshire, the latter cheese not being of such good quality, 1997-1999——Reasons which lead to the difference in the quality of the product made at isolated farms, 2000-2004——Prac-

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Hill, Edmond. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

tice of the Somerset County Council to send a school from district to district to learn *the art of cheese-making*, 2004. 2045. 2047–2049.

Failure of the attempt to produce good cheese in English factories, 2005. 2073——*Improbability of wholesale buyers being* deceived, 2012–2014——Opinion unfavourable *to the branding of the Cheddar made in Scotland*, 2019–2022.

Examination as to whether the fancy cheeses made in England, in all respects similar to Gruyere, Gorgonzola, &c., ought not to be marked; belief that it would be unnecessary, 2023-2034——Statement that the best cheesemakers employ no foreign substance, 2036, 2037——Experience that English Cheddar has a larger sale than any other English cheese, 2071. 2081–2087.

Home Produce (*Meat, Cheese, &c.*). Probability that an expert would experience great difficulty in deciding between home and foreign meat had the former been refrigerated, *Cooper* 616-620. 657–665. 842–847——Very little English beef coming into the London dead meat market, English beasts being, as a rule, bought by butchers who have slaughter-houses, *Jerrett* 1459.

Objection to the suggestion for marking home produce, *Hutcheson* 1657–1662. 1811, 1812. 1835–1841——Concurrence in the suggestion that the marking of foreign importations would increase the demand for superior English produce, *Smith* 2237-2240——Grounds for concluding that the Bill will prove most detrimental to home produce, *Kellitt* 2383–2396. 2406, 2407. 2498-2507.

Reasons which lead to the opinion that English cattle are deteriorating, *Coggan* 4127, 4128. 4163-4166——Impossibility of detecting the difference between the better class of foreign meat and English meat, *ib.* 4136-4139.

Returns handed in by Mr. Elliott, together with memorandum, explanatory of the estimated quantities of meat represented by the home production relatively to the imports of live animals and of dead meat in the several years 1892–96; *App.* 197–209.

See also *American Beef.* *Bacon and Hams.* *Cheese.* *Live Meat.* *Meat.*

Hopkin, Morgan. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is a meat salesman and cattle dealer carrying on business at Swansea; has for several years represented the traders of South Wales on the executive of the National Federation of Meat Traders, and gave evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, 3007–3009.

Opinion unfavourable to the branding or labelling of foreign meat; explanation of the reasons which have led witness to change his opinion on this subject, 3012. 3018–3020. 3049, 3050. 3053–3057. 3127–3143. 3149, 3159——Suggestion that the best means of identifying English and foreign meat would be to separate the departments in all establishments where it is sold, 3012–3017. 3020, 3021. 3058, 3059. 3087, 3088——Necessity for appointing inspectors to sse that the foreign meat was not changed from its own department to that of the English, 3022–3030. 3089–3091.

View of witness that frozen mutton can easily be detected, but that refrigerated meat is very difficult to distinguish, 3023–3028. 3107–3112——Question as to whether the Bill will benefit the British agriculturist; belief that it will not, 3031–3035. 3059——Grounds upon which witness is to a certain extent in favour of the Bill, 3036-3038. 3104-3107——Experience that the sale of foreign meat has proved detrimental to farmers, 3039.

Opinion that the price of meat is the consideration of the public rather than the country of origin, 3040, 3041——Opposition of the Welsh traders to any alteration in Clause 15 of the Bill; contention that foreign cattle slaughtered after import should be considered as British, 3042–3048. 3058. 3060–3062. 3080–3086. 3113–3126——Impossibility of distinguishing between Canadian and Scotch cattle either alive or dead, 3045-3047. 3062-3069. 3118. 3126.

Examination as to the class of cattle imported from Argentina; at present they are not equal to English although improving, 3070–3086——Information regarding the class of meat provided for the Army, 3094-3103——Practice of witness to buy foreign cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead at certain seasons only, 3124, 3125. 3151-3156——Experience that foreign cattle are less liable to tuberculosis than those bred in England, 3145-3148.

House of Lords Committee. Belief that the House of Lords Committee had great difficulty in arriving at any conclusion in regard to marking, *Cooper* 1009-1011.

Hudson, James, Senior. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Representation by witness of the firm of Messrs. Hudson Brothers, retailers of cheese, bacon, &c., in the City of London and the suburbs, 4188–4190. 4218.

Expression of opinion favourable to the Bill so far as the provision trade is concerned, 4191——Practice of the firm to mark all goods with the name of the country of origin,

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Hudson, Senior, James. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

4191-4200——Explanation of the method adopted for the marking of cheese, butter, bacon, &c., 4201-4207——Reasons for desiring that all goods should be classified as "British" or "foreign"; opinion that the term "colonial" requires consideration, 4208-4214. 4259-4263.

Impossibility of marking small quantities such as rashers of bacon, &c., 4215, 4216——Opinion that all goods should be marked for the information of the public, 4219-4228. 4243——Grounds for thinking it improbable that the Bill will increase the price of English cheese, 4229-4232. 4244-4246——Testimony to the good quality of Canadian cheese, 4230, 4231.

Evidence to the effect that the terms "Wiltshire cut," "Yorkshire cut," &c., are intended as a guide to the retailer and should not be used to mislead the public, 4233-4237——Information as to the kinds of bacon sold by witness' firm, 4238-4242——Examination as to the kind of cheese made in Scotland; explanation that there is a Scotch Cheddar, but that Cheshire and Stilton are made in their own localities, 4247-4254. 4264-4268——Disapproval of the trade in filled cheese, 4269.

Hutcheson, Andrew. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Represents the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland, the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, &c.; farms 1,600 acres in Perthshire and Forfarshire, 1586-1594. 1623-1626. 1741-1744. 1768. 1818-1824.

Unanimous resolution passed by the Highland Agricultural Society against the clause of the Bill which would regard foreign animals slaughtered after import as English meat, 1595-1599. 1621. 1697, 1698. 1746-1757. 1765. 1769. 1828, 1829——Statement that with the above exception the Highland Society are in favour of the Bill, 1600. 1745——Approval of the suggestion to mark foreign meat; improbability of there being any insuperable difficulty in so doing, 1601-1603. 1635-1646. 1652. 1681, 1682. 1759-1764. 1770-1773. 1813-1817. 1825-1827.

Importance of registering dealers in foreign meat and compelling them to display a sign over their shops to that effect, 1604. 1652, 1653. 1683, 1684. 1758. 1844——Consideration of the effect of marking on the price of meat; belief that it will tend to keep the price of home produce at a level rather than to lower it, 1605-1609. 1618, 1619. 1663-1675. 1697. 1714-1716. 1734-1736. 1777-1780. 1805-1808——Probability that deception would be impossible in the wholesale trade, 1610. 1676-1680. 1737-1740.

Question as to the amount of foreign beef sold in Scotland; evidence to the effect that very little is sold as such, 1611-1614. 1799-1804——Grounds for the opinion that the Bill is necessary for the protection of the public, 1613. 1635-1637. 1680. 1704-1706 1719-1722. 1727-1733. 1750-1752. 1773-1776——Attention called to a leading article in the "Mark Lane Express" exposing the fraudulent practice of selling foreign meat as English; this article read, 1615-1617. 1622. 1782-1785. 1842, 1843.

Experience that stock breeding is not as profitable now as it was formerly, 1620——Information respecting the quality of the cattle imported at Deptford; belief that some are equal to the average English but not as good as Scotch, 1627-1634——View that frozen meat is easy of detection, but that with chilled meat detection is much more difficult, 1647-1651.

Desirability of compelling foreign meat to be sold in separate shops, 1654, 1655. 1682. 1699-1703——Explanation of a means by which meat might be efficiently marked, 1656——Objection to the suggestion of marking home produce, 1657-1662. 1811, 1812. 1835-1841——Statement that witness can suggest no means for marking small pieces of meat, 1682. 1695, 1696. 1831-1834.

Question as to the method to be adopted for the sale of veal, kidneys, sweetbreads, &c., all of which are mostly foreign; opinion that they should be sold as foreign meat, 1685-1696. 1830——Reference to the very low class of meat sold in some manufacturing districts, 1699-1703——Examination respecting the probability of the Bill proving of no benefit to agriculturists; willingness of witness to run the risk, 1704-1743.

Concurrence in the suggestion that the regulations in regard to the sale of meat should also apply to cheese, 1766, 1767——Evidence showing that the price of meat varies according to the quality, 1786-1798. 1859-1865——Belief that consumers are willing to pay a fair price for home produce, 1809, 1810. 1845-1848.

I.

Imports (Meat, Cheese, &c.). Details as to the amount of the imports of meat, cheese, &c., for the year 1896, showing the total imports of meat of various kinds to be 19½ million cwts., inclusive of live meat, *Primrose* 1-21. 78-82. 95-114. 159, 160; *App.* 185-196——Largely increasing importations of meat for the last ten years; returns to be supplied on the subject, *Primrose* 22-27.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Imports (*Meat, Cheese, &c.*)—continued.

Statistics (supplied by Mr. Rew) of imports of beef, mutton, bacon, hams, pork, &c., in triennial periods since 1867; enormous increase, *App.* 183——Statistics of imports of cheese from different countries, *ib.* 184. 196.

Paper, handed in by Mr. Primrose, showing in considerable detail the imports of various kinds of meat, cheese, &c., in each of the years 1892–96; also the imports at London, Liverpool, Glasgow, and other principal ports, respectively, *App.* 185–195.

Tabular statements handed in by Mr. Elliott, with explanatory memorandum, respecting imports of various kinds of meat in different years in relation to home supply, *App.* 198–209.

See also *American Beef.* *Bacon and Hams.* *Australia.* *Cheese.* *Live Meat.* *Meat.*

Inspection. Consideration of the question of appointing inspectors in connection with the marking of foreign meat; belief that it would involve great expense, *Cooper* 605–610. 731–735. 944–948——Conclusion that it would be necessary to take a very large quantity of meat in order to arrive at a true decision, *ib.* 908–914——Desirability of a tribunal of appeal for determining disputes arising between inspectors and retailers, *ib.* 917——Probability of an inspector, when called upon by a customer, being unable to decide whether the meat was English or foreign, *ib.* 949–952.

Contention that the passing of the Bill would necessitate a large increase in the number of special inspectors, as the ordinary sanitary official would be unequal to the work of distinguishing between English and foreign meat, *Terrett* 1488–1493. 1549–1557——Belief that the appointment of inspectors is unnecessary, *Kellitt* 2397-2405. 2468——Difficulty that would be experienced by inspectors in detecting the difference between a quarter of English beef, left for a week in a freezing chamber, and foreign meat, *Stephenson* 3270. 3283-3288——Objection to the power given under the Bill to inspectors to seize meat for examination, *ib.* 3274, 3275.

Impossibility for an inspector to tell the country of origin of small pieces of meat, *Byrne* 3894–3896. 3900——Experience that there is very little inspection of frozen meat in retail shops in London, *Coggan* 4047–4050——Opinion that the present inspectors are quite unqualified for their work, *ib.* 4063–4066.

J.

Jeffreys, Arthur F. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Explanation that all meat exposed for sale in Belgium must be stamped, 389, 390——Details in regard to the three marks employed, viz., the Brussels stamp, the provincial stamp, and the stamp for imported meat, 392–396. 399. 410——Statement that the stamp is a guarantee of the soundness of the meat, 396. 430–438.

Description of the manner in which the meat is stamped; impression of the stamp handed in, 397–399——Short space of time occupied in stamping the carcases, 399.——Evidence showing that in some towns the further stamping of joints is carried out by the municipal authorities, 399–409——Experience as to the difficulty in erasing the stamp, 402. 417–419——Practice to impose a severe penalty on a butcher attempting to stamp meat, 411–416.

Examination as to the adoption of branding by other countries besides Belgium; belief that, with the exception of France, most countries have introduced marks, 420. 427——Information respecting the number of oxen, &c., killed weekly in the Government abattoir at Brussels, 428, 429——Statement that the cost of marking is very small, 438, 439. 459.

Opinion that the marking of foreign imported meat should be undertaken by the Custom House at the port of debarkation, 440–443. 457, 458. 460–466——Question as to the intention of the Bill in regard to the marking of small pieces of meat; belief that it is left to the Board of Agriculture, 444–456——Opinion that importers would be glad to stamp their meat, 467.

Probability that systematic marking would render registration unnecessary, 468, 469——Desirability of marking imported meat which had been killed at the ports, 470–477. 479——Objection to soldiers being supplied with meat cut from foreign cattle killed on arrival, 470. 478. 480, 481.

K.

Kellitt, John. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is President of the Federation of Grocers' Associations, also President of the Liverpool Grocers and Provision Dealers' Association, and a director of Messrs. Fowler Brothers, Limited; represents the Federation and trade, interested in this matter, in Liverpool, 2301-2307.

Disappointment

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Kellitt, John. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Disappointment of the Federation that only one witness, as representative of the trade, would be allowed to give evidence, 2308-2310——Experience that customers do not ask the country of origin of bacon or hams, but select the piece they require according to the quality, 2311-2314. 2644——Evidence showing that the retailers can easily distinguish the nationality of the produce sold by him; an Irish and an American ham produced and their different qualities explained, 2315-2323. 2330-2332. 2606, 2607.

Statement that it is possible to detect the difference in the kinds of bacon when it is cut into pieces, 2324-2329. 2552-2557——Explanation of the difference between Cumberland and Irish hams, 2333-2336——Photographs of the different cuts of American bacon produced and explained by witness; they are named "Cumberland," "Wiltshire," &c., after the various English counties, 2338-2344. 2530-2552. 2646-2650.

Question as to whether the bacon in the shops is ticketed according to the above names; this is not usual, 2345-2349——Practice of the best curers to mark particular cuts with their own brand, 2346. 2354-2364. 2446. 2512, 2513——Obligation under the Merchandise Marks Act to mark the boxes in which the American bacon is packed "Produce of America," 2350-2353. 2508-2511——Opinion that most American bacon is of good quality, but that doubtless people would prefer Wiltshire, were it not for the difference in price, 2365-2370, 2517-2529——Impossibility of branding very small pieces of bacon, 2371, 2372. 2569, 2570——Grounds upon which the Federation strongly object to the provisions of the Bill, 2373, 2374.

Reference to the prosecutions brought by the Bacon Curers' Association against certain tradesmen; complaint that they are harassing to the trade, 2374. 2458-2482——View that the proposal to register dealers in foreign bacon, &c., is an insult to the trade, 2375-2383. 2486-2495. 2658-2670——Explanation of the reasons which lead witness to conclude that the Bill will prove most detrimental to home produce, 2383-2396. 2406, 2407. 2498-2507——Belief that the appointment of inspectors is unnecessary, 2397-2405. 2468.

Evidence showing the trade of the firm of Messrs. Fowler to be entirely American produce, but that in the businesses carried on by witness the sales of American and English produce are about equal, 2406-2439——Question regarding the particular cut of bacon chiefly sold by witness; it is mostly American, Cumberland cut, 2416-2425——Examination as to the object of the firm in cutting bacon in imitation of English cuts; this is done to suit the requirements of the particular customers and districts, and is not intended as a deception, 2440-2446.

Improbability of the trade raising any objection to the branding of the sides and hams of bacon, provided the marking did not apply to small pieces. 2446-2458. 2514-2516. 2558-2572. 2602-2604. 2618. 2671——Attention of witness called to the upward tendency in the price of pigs that has taken place since the prosecutions by the Bacon Curers' Association, 2482-2485——Statement that witness would have no objection to a license and a monopoly, 2496, 2497. 2674-2676——Preference given in London to the "Wiltshire cut" bacon, 2539-2545.

Practice to mark cheese on the box in which it is packed; belief that it would be very difficult to stamp the cheese itself, 2573-2592——Explanation of the method adopted by retailers in selling bacon; custom to cut up a side into small pieces from which the customer makes his selection, 2593-2605——Expression of confidence in the honesty of the trade; in the event of a customer asking for English bacon he would get it, 2600. 2608-2618. 2651-2657. 2677-2679.

Grounds for believing that the Bill will benefit neither the farmer nor the consumer, 2619-2631——Statement that the retail grocers do not wish for the Bill, 2634-2640. 2645——Equality of the American and the English full cream cheese, 2641-2643, 2672, 2673.

L.

Leeds. Opinion, as expressed on behalf of the Leeds Butchers' Association, that the Bill is unnecessary, *Stephenson* 3268. 3276——Statement that the small percentage of chilled meat sold in Leeds is advertised and sold as such, *ib.* 3268. 3278. 3287. 3289——Practice to sell foreign and also inferior English meat at a low price in the poorer quarters of the town, *ib.* 3268. 3312-3319. 3338, 3339. 3372-3374.

Experience that the carcases of American cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead are frequently sold by butchers in Leeds during certain periods of the year, *Stephenson* 3270-3273. 3291. 3295-3299. 3305——Particulars respecting the kinds of meat sold by witness and by other dealers; practice of witness to sell foreign and English meat in different shops, *ib.* 3289-3300. 3393-3415——Probability that if registration were enforced it would apply to every butcher in Leeds, *ib.* 3379, 3380. 3382, 3383. 3419, 3420.

Litigation. Opinion that unless Clause 15 is retained the Bill will be worthless and will be the cause of great litigation, *Byrne* 3779. 3802, 3808-3811——Evil of the proposed marking as entailing litigation, *ib.* 3955, 3956.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

LIVE MEAT:

Statistics as to the average annual quantity of live meat, &c., imported into the United Kingdom from 1867 to 1896, calculated according to the percentage of population; evidence showing that the meat imported during the latter triennial period is three times that of the former, *Rew* 174–190. 259–268——Explanation in connection with a generally accepted formula by means of which any quantity of live meat can be readily reduced to an equivalent weight of dead meat, *ib.* 184–188. 291–293. 384, 385——Opinion that live meat slaughtered at the port of entry should be considered as foreign, *ib.* 251–258 — Desirability of marking imported meat which had been killed at the ports, *Jeffreys* 470–477. 479.

Contention that the Bill by allowing foreign cattle killed at the port of entry to be described as British meat is most unjust and would be misleading to the public, *Cooper* 503. 507–509. 601–604. 715–723. 771. 776–789. 994–1008——Evidence to the effect that it is impossible for an expert to detect English joints from foreign when the animals have been killed in this country, *ib.* 594–609. 671–675.

Question as to whether home killed foreign meat is as good as the foreign refrigerated meat; reasons for believing that the latter is preferable, *Cooper* 856, 857; *Terrett* 1569–1582——Testimony to the good condition in which the cattle from abroad arrive at Deptford, *Cooper* 980–985.

Objection to Clause 15, witness submitting that in the interests of the farmer and consumer, all meat imported alive and slaughtered in England should be classed as foreign and the dealers scheduled, *Davies* 1046, 1047. 1065. 1072–1077. 1109. 1120. 1137. 1140. 1155–1163. 1176, 1177. 1275. 1283. 1323, 1337. 1351——Difficulty in distinguishing between English grown meat and that imported alive and killed after a proper interval from the time of landing, the quality being practically the same, *ib.* 1063, 1064. 1066–1068. 1121–1129. 1138. 1207. 1250. 1267–1273. 1284–1290. 1296. 1318–1320——Examination to the effect that the marking of imported live meat would be advantageous to the English grower and consumer, but that in the case of frozen meat the necessity is not so apparent, *ib.* 1073–1098. 1143. 1152, 1153. 1194. 1198–1204. 1223. 1259–1261. 1276. 1327, 1328.

Opinion that imported live meat should be marked, it being inferior to the best home-fed but very difficult to distinguish, *Terrett* 1410. 1440, 1441——Difficulty, in some cases, of telling whether the meat was imported alive and slaughtered here or whether it was home grown, *ib.* 1419——Prejudicial effect of the voyage as regards cattle from America, slaughtered at Deptford, *ib.* 1572–1582.

Information respecting the quality of the cattle imported at Deptford; belief that some are equal to the average English but not as good as Scotch, *Hutcheson* 1627–1634——Practice of witness to buy foreign cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead at certain seasons only, *Hopkin* 3124, 3125. 3151–3156——Opinion that if the Bill is passed foreign cattle slaughtered at English ports should be exempted from marking, *Stephenson* 3276. 3347, 3348——Belief that the marking, as foreign, of the flesh of cattle imported and subsequently killed would advertise the sale of foreign meat; experience of witness in this respect, *ib.* 3306–3311. 3320–3336. 3340–3345. 3381.

Opinion that the beef killed on import should be designated as foreign, *Cameron* 3720——Question as to the desirability of marking States, Canadian, and South American cattle, &c., according to their country of origin, instead of classing them all in one category; belief that it would be unworkable, *Stephenson* 3884–3892——Belief that if Clause 15, relating to cattle slaughtered on import, is eliminated the Bill will be worthless, *Coggan* 4075–4081. 4088.

Table showing average annual value of live meat imported in triennial periods since 1867, *App.* 183.

Returns of imports of different kinds of live meat imported in each of the years 1892–96, specifying the amount from each foreign country, *App.* 185–195.

Number of oxen and bulls, cows, calves, sheep and lambs, and swine, imported from different foreign countries in each of the years 1892–96, distinguishing between the different ports, *App.* 185–187. 191, 192.

Detailed statistics supplied by Mr. Elliott, with memorandum in explanation, respecting the live imports of various kinds in the years 1892–96, *App.* 198–209.

See also *Birkenhead. Canada. Carcases.*

Liverpool. Representations on the part of the grocers and provision dealers of Liverpool, *Kellitt* 2301 *et seq.*——Disappointment of the Grocers' Federation that only one witness, as representative of the trade, would be allowed to give evidence, *ib.* 2308–2310.

Grounds upon which the Federation strongly object to the provision of the Bill, *Kellitt* 2373, 2374——Evidence showing the trade of the firm of Messrs. Fowler to be entirely American produce, but that in the businesses carried on by witness the sales of American and English produce are about equal, *ib.* 2429–2439——Statistics of imports of different kinds at the port of Liverpool, *App.* 191–196.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

London Butchers' Trade Society. Information in regard to a draft Bill prepared by the London Butchers' Society, *Coggan* 4122–4127.

London Central Meat and Poultry Markets Association. Reference to the petition of this association; unanimity of the petitioners against the provisions of the Bill as impracticable and liable to harass legitimate trade, *Cooper* 510–513. 543, 544.

London Chamber of Commerce. Unanimous disapproval of the Bill by the meat and cattle section of the London Chamber of Commerce; resolution passed by that body on this subject read by witness, *Cooper* 489–499.

M.

Manufacturing Districts. Reference to the very low class of meat sold in some manufacturing districts, *Hutcheson* 1699–1703.

MEAT (FOREIGN DEAD MEAT):

1. *General Question as to the Expediency or otherwise of Marking Foreign Dead Meat; conflicting Opinions on the Subject.*
2. *Suggestions as to the Method of Marking.*
3. *Quality and Quantity; Statistics of Import.*
4. *Question of separate Departments or Counters for the Sale of Foreign and English Meat respectively.*
5. *Conclusions of the Committee.*

1. *General Question as to the Expediency or otherwise of Marking Foreign Dead Meat; conflicting Opinions on the Subject:*

Grounds for the opinion that as regards the question of marking there is no necessity for legislative action in regard to the wholesale trade in foreign meat; conclusion that fraud mostly occurs in the retail selling, *Primrose* 31–38. 54–58. 89. 115–117. 126–130. 133, 134. 137. 144–146——Probability that in the event of meat being marked prior to exportation only about 1 per cent. would be examined by the Customs, as in the case of carcases, *ib.* 131, 132. 138–143——Evidence showing that little, if any, notice is taken by the Customs of dead meat, owing to the impossibility of its concealing dutiable articles, *ib.* 152–157.

Desirability of marking foreign meat and cheese, *Rew* 246. 311–320. 353–355——Opinion that the duty of marking foreign dead meat should rest on the shipper, *ib.* 353——Suggestion that the marking of foreign imported meat should be undertaken by the Custom House at the port of debarkation, *Jeffreys* 440–443. 457, 458. 460–466——Question as to the intention of the Bill in regard to the marking of small pieces of meat; belief that it is left to the Board of Agriculture, *ib.* 444–456——Opinion that importers would be glad to stamp their meat, *ib.* 467.

Reasons for believing that the Bill will create rather than remove difficulties, *Cooper* 686–692. 740. 772–775. 863–870. 991–993——Statement that witness objects to any form of marking, *ib.* 688. 739——Question as to the probability of difficulty in applying the provisions of the Bill in the case of meat, *Davies* 1291–1295. 1371——Absence of necessity for attempting to differentiate between English and foreign meat, *Terrett* 1411–1413. 1558——Belief that the consumption of foreign-killed rather than home-grown meat would largely increase in the event of Clause 15 becoming law, *ib.* 1428–1430.

Approval of the suggestion to mark foreign meat; improbability of there being any insuperable difficulty in so doing, *Hutcheson* 1601–1603. 1635–1646. 1652. 1681, 1682. 1759–1764. 1770–1773. 1813–1817. 1825–1827——Expression of opinion favourable to the marking of meat, *Hill* 1903–1906——Opinion unfavourable to the branding or labelling of foreign meat; explanation of the reasons which have led witness to change his opinion on this subject, *Hopkin* 3012. 3018–3020. 3049, 3050. 3053–3057. 3127–3143. 3149, 3150——Grounds upon which witness is to a certain extent in favour of the Bill, *ib.* 3036–3038. 3104–3107.

Objections to the marking of meat in any form, on the grounds that it would be of no advantage to the public, and would prove harassing to the trade, *Stephenson* 3282–3286. 3330, 3331. 3347. 3353——Disapproval of the Bill on the ground that the marking of meat is unnecessary and impracticable, *Byrne* 3775–3778. 3901–3906. 3922–3956. 3987——Positive objection to compulsory marking of foreign meat, *Byrne* 3946. 3956.

Statement that witness agrees generally with the evidence given by Mr. Cooper, *Coggan* 4029–4031——Opinion unfavourable to the Bill, *ib.* 4035, 4036——Opposition to the Bill on the ground that any interference with the ordinary treatment will entail loss, owing to the perishable nature of the article, *ib.* 4038–4050——Impossibility of distinguishing British meat from foreign should the former have been placed in a refrigerating chamber, *ib.* 4051–4062. 4129–4135——The enormous expense which would be incurred is another reason for objecting to the Bill, *ib.* 4063. 4067.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

MEAT (*FOREIGN DEAD MEAT*)—continued.

2. *Suggestions as to the Method of Marking :*

Examination respecting the difficulties which would arise should meat arrive unmarked; explanation of a method which might be adopted in such circumstances, *Primrose* 68–73 —— Belief that the marking of every joint would be practically impossible, *Cooper* 580–584. 699-707. 790-793——Suggested means by which meat might be efficiently marked, *Hutcheson* 1656 —— Explanation that witness can suggest no means of marking small pieces of meat, *ib.* 1682. 1695, 1696. 1831–1834.

Statement showing that witness has invented an instrument by means of which meat can be easily marked; mutton chop produced and branded, *Beach* 2283–2289. 2299, 2300——Information respecting the cost and durability of the instrument in question, *ib.* 2290–2294——Opinion that a man could mark a carcase in fifteen seconds, *ib.* 2295–2298.

Impossibility of marking small pieces of meat, *Stephenson* 3268, 3269——Consideration of the methods suggested for the marking of meat; grounds for objecting to the use of ink or electricity, *Coggan* 4158–4162.

3. *Quality and Quantity ; Statistics of Import :*

Information as to the great increase in the quantity of imported dead meat in recent years, *Primrose* 5-27; *Rew* 191–201——Details respecting the total quantity and value, and the value per cwt. and per lb., of the different kinds of meat imported in 1896; *Rew* 202–208. 331, 332——Import of more than two-thirds of the total consumption of meat, *ib.* 266.

Testimony to the good quality of the imported dead meat; belief that it is superior to the very best of the second class of English-fed bullocks, *Cooper* 633–636. 681–683. 713. 835–841 —— Experience that the large influx of foreign meat has done away with the inferior qualities of English meat formerly sold, *ib.* 853-855——Large amount of foreign meat consumed in the metropolis ; statement that it forms two-thirds of the total consumption, *ib.* 890–896. 927–933——Reference to a case in which an expert was deceived in a consignment of meat, *ib.* 907——Explanation of the various ways of dressing meat; the difference between the dressing of American and English meat is almost imperceptible, *ib.* 953–966.

Denial that misrepresentation exists to any extent, foreign meat being, as a rule, supplied by high-class tradesmen, and under contract to hotels, &c., *Terrett* 1445–1447 1460–1483. 1499. 1516, 1517. 1522–1529. 1583–1585——Contention that very little foreign meat is sold as English, *Stephenson* 3270. 3302–3305. 3361–3365.

Table showing the average annual quantity of live meat and of dead meat, and the total meat, imported into the United Kingdom in triennial periods since 1867; also the rate per head of the population, *App.* 183——Total quantity and value, and value per weight and per pound, of meat of different kinds imported in 1896, *ib.*

Returns, submitted by Mr. Primrose, showing the quantities of beef, mutton, pork, &c., imported in each of the years 1892–96, *App.* 185–195.

Statistics handed in by Mr. Elliott, with explanations thereon, respecting imports of beef and veal, mutton and lamb, veal, pork, &c., in the years 1892–96; also the total meat imports in those years in relation to the home production, *App.* 198-209.

4. *Question of separate Departments or Counters for the Sale of Foreign and English Meat respectively :*

Impracticability of keeping English and foreign meat at separate counters, as in the case of small retailers, *Cooper* 513–528. 578–584. 724–726; *Terrett* 1518–1521; *Stephenson* 3279. 3331–3337. 3416–3418; *Byrne* 3893——Suggestion that in butchers' shops separate compartments or counters should be provided for the sale of foreign meat, *Davies* 1361-1370 ; *Hutcheson* 1654, 1655. 1682. 1699–1703; *Hopkin* 3012–3017. 3020, 3021. 3058, 3059. 3087, 3088——Necessity for appointing inspectors to see that the foreign meat was not changed from its own department to that of the English, *ib.* 3022–3030. 3089-3091.

5. *Conclusions of the Committee :*

Opinion of the Committee that the identification of foreign meat is desirable, and that there would be no great difficulty in carrying this out as regards carcases, *Special Rep.* iii.

Conclusion that any legislation in the direction of marking meat would be inadequate unless means be taken to distinguish between British and Irish meat, on the one hand, and that produced in our colonies, and that produced in all other countries and landed here,

Report, 1897—*continued.*

MEAT (*FOREIGN DEAD MEAT*)—continued.

5. *Conclusions of the Committee*—continued.

here alive to be slaughtered at the port of debarkation, on the other hand, *Special Rep.* iii.

See also *American Beef. Australia. Bacon and Hams. Belgium. Canada. Carcases. Chilled Meat. Consumers. Farmers. Fraud. Frozen Meat. Home Supply. Inspection. Leeds. Live Meat. New Zealand. Poorer Classes. Price. Retail Trade. Tuberculosis.*

Merchandise Marks Act (1887). Information as to the infringement of the Merchandise Marks Act in the case of butter, eggs, and cheese, *Primrose* 118-125——Letter written by witness in 1893 to the Editor of the "Morning Post," with reference to the operation of the Merchandise Marks Act, and the question of marking bacon and hams, *Smith* 2116——Opinion that of recent years the Act has to a great extent prevented the fraudulent sale of foreign bacon, *ib.* 2136-2145. 2153. 2196. 2245-2257.

Belief that a more rigid enforcement of the Merchandise Marks Act would meet all requirements, *Tee* 3182. 3261——Opinion that persons who fraudulently sell foreign meat as English are liable to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act, *Stephenson* 3270.

Mutton. See *the Headings generally throughout the Index.*

N.

New Zealand. Evidence showing that English cheese, bacon, and hams have a good sale in New Zealand and fetch a high price, *Hill* 1901, 1902——Statement that the exports of New Zealand are frozen mutton and lamb, butter, cheese, rabbits, &c., *Cameron* 3669——Explanation of the method adopted, according to law, for the marking of the above exports, *ib.* 3670-3676. 3725, 3726——Evidence respecting the duties of the inspectors at the ports of shipment, *ib.* 3677, 3678. 3741, 3742.

Information as to the price of New Zealand mutton, showing it to stand at a rather higher price than Australian, *Cameron* 3679——Testimony to the suitability of the New Zealand climate for farming purposes, *ib.* 3680-3684——Reasons for believing that the importation of New Zealand meat has not injured the English farmer, *ib.* 3682.

Particulars respecting the very large quantity of New Zealand mutton imported annually into England, *Cameron* 3685-3692——Experience of witness in a business called "The New Zealand Produce Stores," in Manchester, opened solely for the sale of New Zealand produce; prejudice of the people against foreign meat, *ib.* 3702-3718.

Non-Completion of Inquiry. Inability of the Committee to complete in the Session of 1897 the evidence which bears upon the Bill, which is therefore reported to the House without amendment, *Special Rep.* iii.

P.

Page, Alfred Samuel. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Represents the firm of Messrs. S. Page and Son, wholesale merchants and dealers, 2680-2684. 2748-2750.

Approval of the suggestion of the Bill that cheese should be marked with the country of origin; reasons given, 2685-2688. 2704-2706. 2746-2750. 2754-2761——Evidence showing that the cheese at present imported is not always marked, 2689-2696. 2707-2713——Description of the method to be employed for the marking of cheese; belief that it would present no difficulty, 2697-2699. 2726.

Improbability of there being any great amount of fraud in the sale of cheese, 2700, 2701. 2797-2801——Statement that witness deals chiefly in States, Canadian, and New Zealand cheese, 2702, 2703——Particulars respecting the variation in price between the best Canadian and the best English cheese, 2714-2723——Preference given by witness to the best English rather than to that of foreign production, although a good deal of the latter is of excellent quality, 2725. 2742-2745.

Practice under the Merchandise Marks Act to brand the place of origin on all cheese boxes, 2727——Information showing that it is customary to send the cheese to the grocer in the box so that he cannot be deceived as to the country of origin, 2728-2733——Examination as to the use of the word "Cheddar"; explanation that it now applies to cheese made in that particular shape, 2734-2741——Desirability of branding bacon and ham, 2751-2753.

Question in regard to the manner in which the Bill would affect the business of grocers; explanation of the views of witness on this subject, 2762-2788——Belief that the Bill would afford a certain amount of protection to consumers, 2788-2805. 2842-2847——Attention of witness called to the fact that the Bill may benefit the producer at the expense of the consumer, 2806-2817——Admission that the passing of the Bill will probably improve the foreign and colonial trade in cheese, 2818-2841.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Pearks, Gunston and Tee, Limited. Representations in detail on the part of Messrs. Pearks, Gunston and Tee, Limited, proprietors of several retail provision shops in London, *Tee* 3161 *et seq.*

Poorer Classes. Improbability of the marking of meat reducing its price to the poor, *Cooper* 938-941——Admission that under the Bill the working classes would be more likely to purchase the cheaper beef, and so create a greater demand for imported meat to the detriment of the English producer, *Davies* 1107–1109. 1112, 1113. 1170–1175. 1178–1182. 1252. 1334. 1341.——*See* also *Consumers. Prices.*

PRICES:

Examination upon the question as to the effect of the reduction of foreign competition on the prices of English meat; opinion that the case is hypothetical owing to the improbability of the Bill causing any diminution in the imports of foreign meat, *Rew,* 269–279. 294–301. 351, 352. 356, 357. 360-363——Experience that the public consider the price of meat rather than the quality, *Cooper* 727–730. 753, 754. 802–804——Conclusion that the price of the home supply of meat is indirectly affected by the relative price of foreign importations, *ib.* 851, 852——Details of the prices at which the best joints of foreign and English meat are sold, *ib.* 894–903. 986-990. 1012, 1013.

Comparison between the price of English and foreign beef, showing that the latter is cheaper by 1*d.* or 2*d.* per lb., *Davies* 1099–1106. 1195–1197. 1242, 1243. 1304–1312——Statement that the better classes would prefer paying higher prices provided they could be certain of obtaining home-grown produce, *ib.* 1110, 1111. 1114. 1166–1169. 1217–1222. 1251–1253. 1277. 1324.

Effect of the low-priced colonial and foreign meat, combined with increased closeness of inspection, in eliminating the inferior British qualities, *Terrett* 1431–1434. 1484-1487. 1512–1515——Consideration of the effect of marking on the price of meat; belief that it will tend to keep the price of home produce at a level rather than to lower it, *Hutcheson* 1605–1609. 1618, 1619. 1663–1675. 1697. 1714–1716. 1734–1736. 1777–1780. 1805–1808——Evidence showing that the price of meat varies according to the quality, 1786–1798. 1859–1865——Belief that consumers are willing to pay a fair price for home produce, *ib.* 1809, 1810. 1845–1848.

Opinion that the price of meat is the chief consideration of the public, rather than the country of origin, *Hopkins* 3040, 3041——Experience that there has been little variation in the price of meat during the last few years, *Sinclair* 3613–3616——Consideration of the probable effect of the Bill on the price of meat, *Cameron* 3737–3769.

Examination as to the difference in price paid by retailers for English and foreign beef; statement that it is not more than from ½*d.* to ¾*d.* per lb., *Byrne* 3826–3832. 3958–3971 —— Dissent from statement by Mr. Davies on the foregoing point, *ib.* 3828–3830.

See also *American Beef. Bacon and Hams. Cheese. Fraud.*

Primrose, H. W., C.B., C.S.I. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Witness, as Chairman of the Board of Customs, supplies details as to the amount of the imports of meat, cheese, &c., for the year 1896, showing that the import of meat of different kinds (inclusive of dead meat) was 19½ million cwts., 1–21. 78–82. 95–114. 159, 160——Representation that the foreign importations are largely increasing, 22–27.

Explanation that, under the Bill, the Customs would have no power to take action at the time of importation; reasons for believing that any such action is not requisite, and would be impracticable, 28–53. 59–62——Grounds for the opinion that there is no necessity for action in regard to the wholesale trade in foreign meat; conclusion that fraud mostly occurs in the retail selling, 31–38. 54–58. 89. 115–117. 126–130. 133, 134. 137. 144–146——Probability that benefits might accrue if the carcases could, without detriment, be very fully marked, 38——Question as to the practicability of ensuring the marking of carcases by the consignors; belief that this suggestion would be willingly accepted, 63–76. 149–151.

Examination respecting the difficulties which would arise should meat arrive unmarked; explanation of a method which might be adopted in such circumstances, 68–73—— Opinion that the difficulty of marking cheese, ham and bacon, would be but small, 77. 83, 84——Information as to the infringement of the Merchandise Marks Act in the case of butter, eggs, and cheese. 118–125.

Probability that in the event of meat being marked prior to exportation only about 1 per cent. would be examined by the Customs, 131, 132. 138–143——Evidence showing that little, if any, notice is taken by the Customs of dead meat, owing to the impossibility of its concealing dutiable articles, 152–157.

Prosecutions. Objection to the clause in the Bill which allows a prosecution against a butcher within a period of three months from the time the meat was taken by the inspector; opinion that this is too long a limit, *Cooper* 610–615; *Coggan* 4075–4077 ——Objection more especially to the wording of Clauses 4 and 5 of the Bill on the ground of its ambiguity, *Cooper* 637–651——Reasons for opposing the provision which enables a private person to institute a prosecution, *Coggan* 4072–4075.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Provision Trade. Expression of opinion favourable to the Bill so far as the provision trade is concerned, *Hudson* 4191——Practice of witness' firm to mark all goods with the name of the country of origin, *ib.* 4191–4200——Impossibility of marking small quantities, such as rashers of bacon, &c., 4215, 4216.

See also *Bacon and Hams. Cheese.*

R.

Registration of Dealers. Necessity for the registration of dealers in foreign meat and cheese, *Rew* 246–250——Probability that systematic marking would render registration unnecessary, *Jeffreys* 468, 469——Reasons for disapproving of the suggestion that dealers in foreign meat should be registered, *Cooper* 622-628. 652-657. 741-752. 831-834. 904-906; *Terrett* 1494–1498; *Coggan* 4117, 4118; *Byrne* 3839-3850. 3980-3986——Approval of the provisions of Clause 5 of the Bill, subject to the suggestion that dealers in foreign meat should exhibit notices to the effect that they are duly registered, *Davis* 1038–1045. 1164. 1238-1240. 1259. 1341. 1357.

Importance of registering dealers in foreign meat and compelling them to display a sign over their shops to that effect, *Hutcheson* 1604. 1652, 1653. 1683, 1684. 1758. 1844——Opinion that the proposal to register dealers in foreign bacon, &c., is an insult to the trade, *Kellitt* 2375-2383. 2486-2495. 2658-2670——Reasons for objecting to the registration of dealers in foreign produce and compelling them to exhibit a notice to that effect; withdrawal of this objection provided the words "British and Foreign" are permitted, *Tee* 3188, 3189. 3197, 3198. 3226-3229. 3256-3258——View favourable to the registration of butchers dealing in foreign meat, *Cameron* 3730-3735.

Retail Trade:

Suggestion that vendors of foreign meat should notify the fact by means of a sign, *Rew* 246——Experience that a large proportion of the meat in the wholesale market is sold to retailers in portions rather than in carcases, *Cooper* 585-594. 794, 795——Undesirability of compelling retail dealers selling foreign meat to place a notice to that effect over their shops, *ib.* 628–632. 676-680. 684, 685——Examination as to whether a retail tradesman can always distinguish between English and foreign meat; belief that he can, *ib.* 761–770——Consideration of the injury to dealers in first-class meat by any misrepresentation on the part of the retailer as to the origin of the meat, *ib.* 848–850.

Desirability of dealers in foreign produce notifying the fact by means of a signboard in addition to registration, *Challinor* 2864–2867. 2953-2962. 2996–3000——Indifference of witness as to whether the Bill is accepted or not, as regards the retail provision trade in London, *Tee* 3167, 3168. 3225——Reasons for removing the tickets of origin on foreign meat before selling it to the customer, *Stephenson* 3424-3427.

Opinion that dealers in British meat should be allowed to sell colonial produce without restriction, provided it is designated as such, *Robertson* 3462–3465. 3469. 3483-3485——Evidence purporting to show that the Bill would not prove harassing to the retail dealer, *Cameron* 3721-3724——Memorandum read by witness in connection with Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill; contention that they include retail sales, *Coggan* 4127.

See also *Consumers. Fraud. Inspection. Meat*, 4. *Registration of Dealers.*

Rew, Robert Henry. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Witness is secretary of the Central Chamber of Agriculture; also represents the Associated Chambers of Agriculture, 161 165.

Approval by the Council of the principles of the Agricultural Produce Marks Bill, 166. 251——Opinion that the farmers are unanimously in favour of the principles of the Bill, 167-173——Statistics as to the average annual quantity of live meat, &c., imported into the United Kingdom from 1867 to 1896, calculated according to the percentage of population; evidence showing that the meat imported during the latter triennial period is three times that of the former, 174–190. 259–268.

Explanations in connection with a generally accepted formula by means of which any quantity of live meat can be readily reduced to an equivalent weight of dead meat, 184-188. 291-293. 384, 385——Information as to the great increase in the quantity of imported dead meat, 191-201——Details respecting the total quantity and value, and the value per hundredweight and per pound, of the different kinds of meat imported in 1896; 202-208. 331, 332.

Particulars in regard to the quinquennial average of the cheese imported since 1861, showing the increase to have been comparatively small, 209-219——Explanation of the method adopted by witness for calculating the average home produce of cheese, 220-228.

Conclusion that the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords practically proved that foreign meat and cheese are sold as English; impossibility of estimating the quantity thus misrepresented, 229–233. 333–337. 372, 373. 386, 387——Opinion of farmers that all meat should be sold on its own merits, 234. 287–290——Belief that purchasers have a preference for English meat, 235–245.

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Rew, Robert Henry. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Desirability of marking foreign meat and cheese, 246. 311–320. 353–355——Necessity for the registration of dealers in foreign meat and cheese, 246–250——Suggestion by farmers that vendors of foreign meat should notify the fact by means of a sign, 246——Opinion that live meat slaughtered at the port of entry should be considered as foreign, 251–258——Import of more than two-thirds of the total consumption, 266.

Examination upon the question as to the effect of the reduction of foreign competition on the price of English meat; opinion that the case is hypothetical owing to the improbability of the Bill causing any diminution in the imports of foreign meat, 269–279. 294–301. 351, 352. 356, 357. 360–363——Details respecting the amount of tuberculosis amongst English cattle as compared with foreign; difficulty of detecting this disease in foreign meat, 280–287. 358, 359——Evidence showing that the branding of English meat would involve the establishment of public abattoirs, 314–320. 364–367.

Opinion that the duty of marking foreign dead meat should rest on the shipper, 353——Consideration of the risk to the English farmer should the public prefer foreign meat to English owing to its being of good quality and cheap, 338–350——Improbability of a customer being able, in the majority of cases, to differentiate between English and foreign joints, 338. 374–383.

Robertson, Professor James W. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying for Canada; represents the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion, 3428–3430. 3486–3489.

Opinion strongly in favour of marking Canadian products, 3431. 3515, 3516. 3547, 3548——Evidence showing that it is practicable to mark eggs, poultry, fruit, and butter on the boxes only, 3432–3438. 3526–3528. 3537–3539——Practice to mark cheese on the box and also on the rind by means of a stencil stamp, 3439, 3440. 3530–3533.

Statement that the first instalment of Canadian chilled beef which arrived quite recently was marked on the cloth covering, 3441–3444. 3540–3542——Willingness of the producers to mark their products, 3445–3450——Prohibition by the law of Canada of the sale of imitation cheese, 3450, 3451. 3471–3473. 3492, 3493——Violation of the law, punishable by fine, if cheese and butter are not marked "Canadian" before leaving the factory, 3452–3455.

Unfairness of the suggestion to class Canadian meat and cheese imported into this country as "foreign"; desirability of branding them "Canadian," 3456–3461. 3490, 3491. 3520–3525. 3529. 3568–3573——Opinion that dealers in British meat should be allowed to sell Colonial produce without restriction, provided it is designated as such, 3462–3465, 3469. 3483–3485——Danger of Canadian cattle slaughtered on import being sold as English unless some preventive means are taken, 3466–3469. 3499–3511. 3534–3536.

Explanation of the regulations made by the Department of Agriculture to ensure the delivery of Canadian products in the best condition, 3470–3476. 3482——Details as to the price of Canadian butter; belief that it will ultimately rival that sent from Denmark, 3477–3482——Evidence showing that the word "Cheddar" does not designate a locality, but is a system of manufacture, 3494–3498. 3561–3567.

Freedom of Canadian cattle from tuberculosis, 3512–3514——Experience that the prohibition to store Canadian cattle in England previous to slaughter has been disadvantageous, 3517–3519——Desirability of marking the carcases of imported Canadian cattle if it is enacted by legislation that Canadian chilled beef should be marked, 3543–3546——Conclusion that four-fifths of the beef from Canada is sold as English and cotch at full price, 3549–3560.

S.

Samples. Objection to the clause which enables samples of food, in regard to which no offence under the Act could be committed, to be taken for inspection, *Cooper* 915, 916. 918–922——Impossibility of distinguishing between English and foreign meat by taking small samples; any examination to be of value must be in bulk, *Terrett* 1416–1418. 1458.——Objection to the permission given under the Bill to inspectors to take samples of meat without payment, *Coggan* 4068–4071.

Scotland. Question as to the amount of foreign beef sold in Scotland; evidence to the effect that very little is sold as such, *Hutcheson* 1611–1614. 1799–1804.

See also *Aberdeenshire. Highland Agricultural Society.*

Sinclair, James M. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is superintendent of exports for the Victorian Government; represents all the Australian colonies, 3574–3578.

Objection to the classification of Australian products as foreign; preference given to the word "Australian," 3580–3582, 3629–3631——Evidence showing it to be the practice

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Sinclair, James M. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

practice of Victoria and New South Wales to brand their products, 3583, 3584. 3628——Information in regard to the Exports Bill now under the consideration of the Victorian Government, 3585–3595. 3637, 3638 —Details showing the magnitude of the Australian frozen meat trade with Great Britain, 3596-3602——Practice in the Australian colonies to have a system of stock inspection, 3603–3612——Statement as to the immunity of the cattle from disease, 3605-3609. 3659-3663——Experience that there has been little variation in the price of meat during the last few years, 3613–3616.

Enumeration of the various countries to which Australian meat is exported, 3617–3621——Information respecting the export of butter from Australia; occasionally it equals Danish in price, 3622-3625——Custom of the Australian colonies to mark the meat on the wrappers, 3632–3636.

Explanation that witness is appointed by the Victorian Government to inspect all products on their arrival in England, 3638-3642——Grounds for denying the statement made in the House of Commons that Australian meat was liable to cause disease, 3642-3653——Particulars respecting some experiments carried out by Dr. Rideal in connection with the digestive and nutritive properties of frozen meat; very satisfactory conclusions arrived at, 3654-3662.

Smith, Herbert. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is agent to the Marquess of Lansdowne and other large landowners and a Fellow of the Institute of Surveyors, and is Chairman and Managing Director of the Wiltshire Bacon Curing Company and the Chippenham Cheese Factory, 2104–2112.

Opinion in favour of marking high-class foreign produce in order to protect the consumer, 2113–2115. 2151, 2152. 2179, 2180. 2226–2233. 2275–2282——Letter written by witness in 1893 to the editor of the "Morning Post," with reference to the operation of the Merchandise Marks Act, and the question of marking bacon and hams, 2116——Explanation of the method adopted for marking the first quality of bacon, 2117–2121. 2263–2269——Statement that the inferior Wiltshire bacon is not branded and is sold at a cheaper rate, 2118, 2119.

Evidence showing that in Denmark all meat is marked, mutton chops also bearing an impress, 2122–2130. 2217–2225——Information as to the branding of cheese; practice to mark all those of finest quality unless the purchaser raises an objection, 2130–2135. 2273, 2274——Opinion that of recent years the Merchandise Marks Act has to a great extent prevented the fraudulent sale of foreign bacon, 2136–2145. 2153. 2196. 2245–2257.

Particulars respecting the quality and price of the various kinds of English, Irish and foreign bacon; testimony to the foreign imports which, although not attaining the standard of high-class Wiltshire bacon, are of good quality, 2146–2150——Description of the varying qualities of English and foreign cheese; no foreign cheese will equal the first quality of English cheddar, 2154–2161——Explanation of the use of the word "Cheddar," showing that it is now used merely to describe the style of cheese, 2159. 2258–2262——Concurrence in statement as to the difficulty of producing good cheese in factories, 2158.

Improbability of foreign cheese being substituted for English to any great extent, 2161–2166. 2190–2193. 2240–2244——Statement that the marking of Wiltshire bacon has been advantageous, but that witness would object to such branding being made compulsory, 2167–2171——Evidence showing that there is no very great necessity for the further marking of foreign bacon, 2172–2178——Belief that the advantages accruing to the agriculturists from the present Bill are remote, 2181, 2182. 2194, 2195.

Reference to the practice of making Camembert and other foreign cheese in England; the quantity is infinitesimal, 2183–2186——Probability that the better class people would prefer English to foreign cheese, 2187–2189——Denial that foreign unmarked bacon is imported and afterwards smoked and branded as Wiltshire, 2196–2204——Experience that no smoked bacon is imported, 2205–2210.

Testimony to the great improvement in Danish fed bacon, 2211–2214——Opinion that many English farmers are in need of some stimulus to make them improve the class of their products, 2233–2236——Concurrence in the suggestion that the marking of foreign importations would increase the demand for superior English produce, 2237–2240——Belief that foreign carcases might be branded without detriment by a similar method to that adopted for bacon, 2270–2272.

South America. Examination as to the class of cattle imported from Argentina; at present they are not equal to English, although improving, *Hopkin* 3070–3086——Experience that South American meat is not so good in quality as States and Canadian, *Byrne* 3820–3825. 3872–3877.

Stephenson, Isaac. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is President of the Leeds Butchers' Association; represents the views of the Association, 3266, 3267. 3368–3371. 3390–3392.

Opinion that the Bill is unnecessary, 3268–3276——Statement that the small per-

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Stephenson, Isaac. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

centage of chilled meat sold in Leeds is advertised and sold as such, 3268. 3278. 3287. 3289——Practice to sell foreign and also inferior English meat at a low price in the poorer quarters of the town, 3268. 3312-3319. 3338, 3339. 3372-3374.

Impossibility of marking small pieces of meat, 3268, 3269——Objection to the marking of meat in any form on the ground that it would be of no advantage to the public and would prove harassing to the trade, 3282-3286. 3330, 3331. 3347-3353——Contention that very little foreign meat is sold as English, 3270. 3302-3305. 3361-3365——Belief that persons who fraudulently sell foreign meat as English are liable to prosecution under the Merchandise Marks Act, 3270.

Reference to the difficulty that would be experienced by inspectors in detecting the difference between a quarter of English beef left for a week in a freezing chamber and frozen meat, 3270. 3283-3288——Experience that the carcases of American cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead are frequently sold by butchers in Leeds during certain periods of the year, 3270-3273. 3291. 3295-3299. 3305——Reasons for the preference given to American rather than to Irish imported cattle, 3272, 3273, 3354-3359.

Information as to the great improvement in American and South American cattle during the last few years; belief that English cattle are deteriorating, 3273, 3274. 3301. 3360——Objection to the power given under the Bill to inspectors to seize meat for examination, 3274, 3275——Opinion that if the Bill is passed foreign cattle slaughtered at English ports should be exempted from marking, 3276. 3347, 3348.

Impracticability of keeping English and foreign meat at separate counters, 3279. 3331-3337. 3416-3418——Evidence showing that frozen meat is easily detected, but that it is almost impossible to distinguish the foreign meat slaughtered on import, 3280, 3281——Information as to the kinds of meat sold in Leeds, 3289-3300.

Belief that the marking as foreign of the flesh of cattle imported and subsequently killed would advertise the sale of foreign meat; experience of witness in this respect, 3306-3311. 3320-3330. 3340-3345. 3381——Examination as to the sale of foreign veal and sweetbreads; belief that very little is sold in first-class shops, 3375-3378. 3421-3423——Probability that if registration were enforced it would apply to every butcher in Leeds, 3379, 3380. 3382, 3383. 3419, 3420.

Evidence showing that cattle slaughtered at Birkenhead are dressed according to requirement, 3384-3386——Experience that tuberculosis is more prevalent amongst English than amongst foreign cattle, 3387-3389——Particulars respecting the kinds of meat sold by witness; practice to sell foreign and English meat in different shops, 3393-3415—— Reasons for removing the tickets of origin on foreign meat before selling it to the customer, 3424-3427.

Stock-breeding. Experiment that stock-breeding is not as profitable now as it was formerly, *Hutcheson* 1620.

T.

Tee, John Francis. (Digest of his Evidence.)—Is managing director of Messrs. Pearks, Gunston and Tee, Limited, proprietors of several retail provision shops in London; has had twenty-three years' experience, 3161-3166.

Indifference of witness as to whether the Bill is accepted or not, 3167, 3168. 3225—— Evidence purporting to show that the marking of sides of bacon will have no effect as far as the consumer is concerned, 3168, 3169. 3182. 3194-3196——Particulars as to the great improvement in the Danish bacon trade; this bacon now obtains a higher price than Irish, 3169-3172. 3193. 3207-3211. 3264, 3265——Opinion that there is very little fraud in the bacon trade, 3173.

Information as to the class of bacon sold by witness' firm showing it to be mostly foreign, 3174. 3183, 3184——Experience that the public choose bacon according to its quality, without inquiry as to the country of origin, 3175-3181. 3189-3192. 3212, 3213. 3219-3221——Belief that a more rigid enforcement of the Merchandise Marks Act would meet all requirements, 3182. 3261.

Examination as to the variation in price between English and foreign bacon; experience that it is but slight, 3185-3187——Explanation of the great variation in the price of bacon given by Mr. Kellitt in his evidence, 3187——Reasons for objecting to the registration of dealers in foreign produce and compelling them to exhibit a notice to that effect; withdrawal of this objection provided the words "British and Foreign" are permitted, 3188, 3189. 3197, 3198. 3226-3229. 3256-3258.

Evidence respecting the large American cheese trade carried on by the firm represented by witness, 3199-3203——Statement that witness offers no objection to the branding of cheese, but considers that it is unnecessary, 3204. 3222-3224——Practice of the firm to advertise their cheese as "Canadian Cheddar," 3205, 3206——Reference to the custom of the best makers to brand their bacon, 3214-3218.

Opinion

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Tee, John Francis. (Digest of his Evidence)—*continued.*

Opinion that American bacon is branded "Wiltshire cut," &c., in order that retailers may distinguish the particular shape they require, and that it is not intended to mislead the public, 3230–3239——Discussion respecting certain proceedings instituted by the Bacon Curers' Association, 3240–3255. 3259–3262——Unsuitability of English bacon for the London trade, 3262–3265.

Terrett, George. (Analysis of his Evidence.)—Is senior inspector of the Central Meat Market at Smithfield; has the supervision of all the retail shops in the City, 1381–1389. 1448–1450. 1461.

Statement that there is but little choice between English and foreign cheese, and that nothing would be gained by applying a mark to the latter, 1390, 1391. 1505–1507——Absence of any particular difficulty in marking cheese, if necessary, 1392–1394——Uselessness from the consumer's point of view, of applying the Belgium system of marking, 1395 1399.

Grounds for assertion that American refrigerated (not frozen) meat is superior to that of cattle brought over and killed in England, 1400–1409. 1436–1438. 1532–1535. 1569–1582——Opinion that imported live meat should be marked, it being inferior to the best home fed, but very difficult to distinguish, 1410. 1440, 1441——Absence of necessity for attempting to differentiate between English and foreign meat, 1411–1413. 1558.

Contention that Clause 15 in its present state would be very prejudicial to agriculturists, 1414——Question of price combined with quality an undoubted inducement to the poorer classes to buy American beef, 1415——Impossibility of distinguishing between English and foreign meat by taking small samples; any examination, to be of value, must be in bulk, 1416–1418. 1458——Difficulty, in some cases, of telling whether the meat was imported alive and slaughtered here, or whether it was home-grown, 1419.——Opinion that the majority of purchasers can readily distinguish between frozen and fresh meat, 1420, 1421——Evidence respecting refrigerated or chilled meat as distinct from the frozen; difficulty of distinction in certain conditions, 1422, 1427.

Belief that the consumption of foreign killed rather than home-grown meat would largely increase in the event of Clause 15 becoming law, 1428–1430——Effect of the low-priced colonial and foreign meat, combined with increased closeness of inspection, in eliminating the inferior British qualities, 1431–1434. 1484–1487. 1512–1515——Advantages likely to accrue to consumers in the event of the origin of the meat being made apparent, 1442—— Doubt as to the public generally preferring English meat to foreign, 1443, 1444.

Denial that misrepresentation exists to any extent, foreign meat being as a rule supplied by high-class tradesmen, under contract, to hotels, &c., 1445–1447. 1460–1483. 1499. 1516, 1517. 1522–1529. 1583–1585——Information as to the American chilled meat being imported and sold in quarters, and the imported wharf-killed animals in sides, 1451–1457——Very little English beef coming into the dead meat market, English beasts being as a rule bought by butchers who have slaughter-houses, 1459.

Contention that the passing of the Bill would necessitate a large increase in the number of special inspectors as the ordinary sanitary official would be unequal to the work of distinguishing between English and foreign meat, 1488–1493. 1549–1557——Opinion that the registration of dealers in foreign meat would be useless, 1494–1498——Objection on the part of the public to any marks on the meat they purchase, 1499–1504.

Impracticability, in the case of small retailers, of the suggestion that their shops should be divided into two compartments, for British and foreign meat, respectively, 1518–1521——Unsatisfactory quality of the Danish cattle and the pork from Ostend, 1536–1548——Estimate that out of the total daily supply of about 1,200 tons at the Central Market there are from 100 to 150 tons of chilled American and from 200 to 250 tons from American cattle killed at Deptford, 1559–1568.

Facility of distinguishing between the Deptford meat, or chilled meat, and English meat in the great majority of cases, 1561–1565——Favourable opinion on the score of quality as regard chilled (not frozen) meat; prejudicial effect of the voyage in the case of cattle from America, 1569–1582.

Tuberculosis. Details respecting the amount of tuberculosis amongst English cattle as compared with foreign; difficulty of detecting this disease in foreign meat, *Rew* 280–287. 358, 359——Evidence to the effect that tuberculosis is more prevalent amongst English and Scotch cattle than amongst foreign cattle, *Cooper* 1017–1023; *Hopkin* 3145–3148; *Stephenson* 3387–3389——Rarity of tuberculosis among the foreign cattle; Denial however that there is a balance in favour of the health of the foreign imports, *Davies* 1136–1139. 1254–1258.

Freedom of Canadian cattle from tuberculosis, *Robertson* 3512–3514——Detailed information in regard to the percentages of English and foreign cattle affected with tuberculosis; in the Hundred of Wirral it would be about 10 to 12 per cent. with the former,

Report, 1897—*continued.*

Tuberculosis—continued.

former, and with the foreign about 1 per cent., *Byrne* 3863-3871. 3907-3917. 3988-4023——Belief that there are inspectors at Deptford to prevent the sale of meat affected by tuberculosis, *Coggan* 4174-4176.

V.

Veal, Sweetbreads, &c. Question as to the method to be adopted for the sale of veal, kidneys, sweetbreads, &c., all of which are mostly foreign; opinion that they should be sold as foreign meat, *Hutcheson* 1685-1696. 1830——Examination as to the sale in Leeds of foreign veal and sweetbreads; belief that very little is sold in first-class shops, *Stephenson* 3375-3378. 3421-3423.

Statistics of import of veal in different years, *App.* 183 *et seq.*

Victoria. See *Australia.*

W.

Wales. Opposition of the Welsh traders to any alteration in Clause 15 of the Bill; contention that foreign cattle slaughtered after import should be considered as British, *Hopkin* 3042-3048. 3058. 3060-3062. 3080-3086. 3113-3126.

Wholesale Dealers. View that there is no necessity to mark meat for the wholesale trade owing to the impossibility of any deception being practised, *Cooper* 544. 553, 554. 691, 692. 794-798——Probability that deception would be impossible in the wholesale trade, *Hutcheson* 1610. 1676-1680. 1737-1740.

See also *Live Meat. Meat* (*Foreign Dead Meat*).

Wirrall Farmers' Club. Witness, who is chairman of the Worrall Farmers' Club, a combination of some 160 farmers, &c., in the district extending from Chester to Birkenhead, submits evidence in detail upon the meat and cheese question, *Davies* 1030 *et seq.*

Digitized with financial assistance from

Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj

on 31 October, 2019